The American Ecclesiastical Review

Vol. CXX, No. 2 FEBRUARY, 1949

CONTENTS

A Trappist Replies to "Pope Celestine VI"
M. Raymond, O.C.S.O. 81

The Hospital Chaplain and Marriage Problems
Francis J. Connell, C.SS.R. 92

Ratum Non Consummatum. Part IV
Thomas Owen Martin 101

The Priest in Radio. Part IV . *William C. Smith* 113

The Church and Catholic Dogma
Joseph Clifford Fenton 123

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

On the Revival of Vespers 135

Precedence of Prelates 136

The *Credo* on St. Patrick's Day 137

Photography in Church 138

Low Masses in Place of High Masses 138

Published monthly by The Catholic University of America Press, Washington 17, D. C. Subscription price in U. S. currency or equivalent: United States, Canada, $5.00; Foreign, $5.00. 50 cents per copy.

Entered as second class matter, November 30, 1944, at the Post Office at Washington, D. C., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Accepted for mailing at the special rate of postage provided for under Act of March 5, 1930, under Act of February 28, 1925.

Business communications, including subscriptions and changes of address, should be addressed to The American Ecclesiastical Review, The Catholic University of America Press, Washington 17, D. C.

Please address all manuscripts and editorial correspondence to The Editor, The American Ecclesiastical Review, The Catholic University of America, Washington, D. C.

Copyright 1949, by The Catholic University of America Press

ANALECTA 141

BOOK REVIEWS

The First Freedom, *by Wilfrid Parsons, S.J.* 153

A Lexicon of St. Thomas Aquinas. Fascicle I, *by Roy J. Deferrari, Sister Mary Inviolata Barry, C.D.P., and Joseph Ignatius McGuiness, O.P.* 154

La mort et l'assomption de la Saint Vièrge, *by Martin Jugie, A.A.* 155

Les Rites et Prières du Saint Sacrifice de la Messe, *by Chanoine Aug. Crocgaert* 158

Discourses on Our Lady, *by Nicholas O'Rafferty* . . . 159

Die Magd des Herrn, *by H. M. Köster* 160

THE IMMORTAL GEORGE WASHINGTON, whose birthday we celebrate this month, bequeathed to his countrymen a great deal of sound advice. One suggestion embodied in his memorable Farewell Address is particularly appropriate at this time. He said: "RELY ON YOURSELVES ONLY: BE AMERICANS IN THOUGHT, WORD AND DEED."

It is not difficult to read into that wise counsel two words we have reiterated on many occasions to buyers of liturgical fabrics, namely: BUY AMERICAN!

"Buy American"

ALLEN SILK MILLS

Manufacturers

Charles M. Muench, *Executive Director*

140 West 31st Street **New York 1, N. Y.**

VESTMENT FABRICS BANDINGS

DRAPERY FABRICS EMBLEMS

Sold exclusively through Church Goods Dealers

IN CANADA: ALLEN SILK MILLS (CANADA) LTD., 400 CRAIG STREET WEST—MONTREAL

A TRAPPIST REPLIES TO "POPE CELESTINE VI"

(Editor's Note: *In 1948, Giovanni Papini's* The Letters of Pope Celestine VI to All Mankind *was published in this country by E. P. Dutton Co. of New York. "Pope Celestine VI," of course, is entirely mythical, and his "Letters" are merely the literary form in which Papini casts his own reflections on the state of religion and the world. Accepting Papini's literary convention, Father Raymond, of the Trappist Abbey of Our Lady of Gethsemani, has written the following reply, in the form of a letter to the imaginary Pope.)*

Most Holy Father Pope Celestine VI:

I am a priest and a monk. Hence, Your Holiness addressed me twice and every one of Your lines stands out like trembling flame written on black velvet. How often have I asked myself the very questions You asked of all priests! And how often have I found them unanswerable. "Do I believe in God?" You ask; ". . . in the living God who gives me life, who shed all the Blood of His veins, all the sweat of His Body, all the tears from His eyes, all the light of His words for the transformation of my life?"

O, Most Holy Father, I want to say that I believe in Him with all my heart and soul, all my intellect and will, with every sinew and nerve of my body, with every last atom of marrow in my bones. I try to tell myself that I would not now be here in Gethsamani, locked in from the world and all its attractions by the five-ply lock of my solemn vows, if I did not so believe. But then, Your strongly true statement comes to me: "If every day when you held in your hands the very Body of the Divine Victim your Faith were rekindled, you would not so often be distracted, so indifferent, so exhausted, so vague." I am each of those things some time or other, Most Holy Father; sometimes I am all of them at once. That is why I dare not affirm that I believe with the burning Faith I desire. Oh, how tragically true it is that "if we were as fire, all would approach to warm their heart. If we were intoxicated, all would sing with us the song of liberty—even in a fiery furnace!" But, Most Holy Father, I confess that "my hands are not burning, my words are not afire, my eyes are not ablaze,

and my face must have that wan pallor of one who lives underground." I own it: as a priest, I am a disgrace to my God.

If Your Letter to Priests opened my eyes, what shall I say of Your Letter to Monks? You wounded me to a depth I never knew existed in my shallow soul. I know my Order was born, as You say, "of the impassioned will" of three Saints—Robert, Alberic and Stephen. I know it was propagated by that incarnation of love for God called Bernard, and was for two hundred golden years "the seed-bed of apostles, the womb of the wise, the nursery of the blessed." But for me? You drew me to the life when You said I, "like a bird who no longer flies, am content to rustle among paper and scratch among library books, to cluck in the Church choir and peck in the refectory." I who should be on "indefatigable wing," a "gull wheeling in the open air," an eagle looking straight into the sun, a swift circling "the hid battlements of Eternity;" what am I? You say we should be "the ravens of Elias, the eagles of St. John, the falcons of St. Francis, the pelicans of Christ." I know we are like birds caged—and we do not even beat our wings against our cage's bars!

You have shamed me to the center of my soul, Most Holy Father. And the torturing part of it is that I have no excuse to offer for my shame. Each excuse that leaps to my lips boomerangs on my honest heart. I cannot offer birth as palliative. Bernard was born of Adam, even as I. He, too, came from the womb of Eve. In his blood, as in mine, swam the seven germs of sin. Yet he became a saint. I cannot blame environment. My father, Benedict of Nursia, knew Rome when she was a running sore, a worm-eaten ulcer, crawling with vice, a sewer of iniquity—even as is my own world. Yet, he became a saint. Assuredly, I cannot blame education. Twenty centuries of flame, flinted by God the Holy Ghost from the steel-sharp intellects of Fathers, Doctors, and Writers of the Church, burning like signal fires on mountains that tower over a stygian world, have been mine. Stabbing into even denser darkness, into the Mystery of all mysteries—the mind and heart of God—have been those searchlight souls, the great Ascetics and Mystics—brothers of mine, my own Fathers in this holy Order of Citeaux. I cannot even take refuge in that Scriptural quote, true though it is, that "the Spirit breatheth where He will"; for Theology will quote back what is equally true: *Facienti quod*

in se est, Deus non denegat gratiam. And St. Paul, that mystic of mystics, confesses and does not deny, he confesses: "I am what I am by the *grace* of God"; and Theology teaches that grace will never be wanting to me. Most Holy Father, I can blame no one but myself.

You have asked: "How many monks are there today who live lives of pure contemplation? Where are the anchorites of the first centuries; where are the penitents who tortured themselves to expiate the sensual pleasure of sin; where are the hermits consecrated to prayer and meditation; where are the mystics ravished with delight in God, united to Christ in His Passion, united to the Creator in a unitive vision?" And I sob the only answer that is mine: Where? I cannot answer, Most Holy Father; and that is the agony of agonies. We have in our hands all that Robert, Alberic, Stephen, and Bernard had. We have all that Benedict himself had. Gethsemani's cloister-wall is no mere symbol in cement. It is a reality! It locks out the worldly world and locks in men who would live with God alone. Not even Catholic magazines or newspapers come through that wall. And though the ether waves that break over it be filled with speech and song, no syllable of either ever reaches the ear of a Gethsemani monk. We are in a world apart. We are alone. Why is it, then, that Your Holiness can still say You do "not perceive among us those ecstatic ones whose gaze is fixed solely on the blinding light of Paradise?" Why is it that You can still say that You "do not know how many there are among us who plunge into the abyss of Divine Love in order to snatch forgiveness for sinners?" Why is it that You can write that condemnation and have it so condemningly true that "if the heroes of action are few, rarer still are the heroes of contemplation?" May God forgive us our white-livered generosity, our venal bravery, and have mercy on our sloth!

I have used the plural here and there, Most Holy Father, but I speak only of and for myself. Cistercian silence is a barrier before the souls of my brethren too high to scale, too thick to ram, too deep to mine. I know them not. But I have seen tall candles burning in the eyes of many, and I doubt not that it was kindled from the Pentecostal Flame. I watch some sink into the deeps of prayer and can only anguish in envy and admiration. So the above is only my acquiescence to all Your Holiness wrote about me as

monk and priest. I know our world is "strewn with mountains of ashes, is a limitless hospital, one vast lunatic asylum." I also know its one need: *sanctity.*

Oh, if someone would only run around America barefooted, as did the poor man from Assisi! If someone would only limp into our halls of learning as did the wounded soldier from Loyola and gather other Xaviers for modern Indies! If someone would only burn as did that Saint of Clairvaux and kindle in every State in the Union pyres for the cremation of our mad, materialistic worldliness, then, phoenix-like, from those ashes, have strong-pinioned, eagle-eyed soarers into the sun arise—men and women who would be saints! We need headlong lovers as were Francis, Ignatius, and Bernard. But, Most Holy Father, perhaps we need even more some men and women like Teresa of Avila, John of the Cross, and the little Lily of Lisieux—cloistered *contemplatives!*

Toward the close of your letter to Monks you say: "In this hour of imminent barbarity, charity is the paramount necessity." Truer words never found way to print. We have seen charity grow cold, Most Holy Father. We have lamented our inability to rekindle it. With Your Holiness, not a few of us have thought we heard the ominous pawing and neighing of the Horses of the Apocalypse. The hour is indeed imminent with barbarity. But when Your Holiness goes on to say: "All else, even science, *even contemplation* must be put aside. . ." then add: ". . . it will be a wonderful day for humanity when you leave your cloisters to journey over the highways of the world, to make the King of Kings Emperor of all human creatures," we gasp, we groan, we fling ourselves at Your Holiness' feet and beg. . . .

I am not Catherine of Siena, Most Holy Father. I have not been raised up by God to instruct Popes. I am but an insignificant monk in a tiny order whose characteristic virtue is simplicity. I am ignorant even of the proper way to address You. Yet I make bold to ask Your Holiness to reflect on the fact that history *does* repeat itself—often with stronger accent. And I plead with you to prevent certain repetitions by bringing about others. Here are the facts:

In the early twelfth century it seemed as if my newly-born Order were about to die. A long sterility seemed indicative of an early demise. But then came Bernard, and Citeaux knew a fertility few

Orders have known before or since. A slight echo of that marvel is being heard in America today. After a century of barrenness, Our Lady of Gethsemani has been delivered of two daughters within the past five years, and by the time You receive this will have given birth to a third, perhaps even to a fourth; for there is a possibility that in her Centenary Year she may bring forth twins! In other parts of the world a similar fecundity is being experienced. It seems as if the Order of Citeaux—at least that branch of it known as the Strict Observance, popularly called "Trappists"—is to know a veritable renaissance. I know this will rejoice Your Paternal heart even as did the incredible fertility of early Citeaux the hearts of the then reigning Pontiffs. But there is precisely where history must not repeat itself.

In that same twelfth century a heresy broke out in the south of France which threatened to swamp the land and render Christianity itself soft and soggy. It was called Albigensianism. It was nothing but the recrudescence of that hydra-headed thing called Manichaeism. But it gripped southern France in tentacles that closed and closed with ever tighter hold. Eugene III sent Cardinal Alberic of Ostia as Legate from the Holy See who finally persuaded Bernard of Clairvaux to go to Languedoc and engage in personal combat with the heretics. Though Bernard's was the very voice of Christ for all Europe at the time, his words had no lasting effect. That twelfth century was not dead—though St. Bernard and Blessed Eugene III were—when the heresy broke out with greater violence. Innocent III felt obliged to call on the King of France to use force. Thereafter history's pages are a horrible blur of human blood. Suffice it to name but Simon de Montfort to conjure up the crimson carnage. But, Most Holy Father, Innocent III also had the Cistercians out in the midst of that melee; out of their monasteries; away from the quiet of contemplation; out there doing all in their power to convert the heretics. The result: failure, *miserable failure!* Cistercian silence does not mother moving preachers. Solitude does not generate that *savoir-faire* essential in dealings with those of the world. These contemplatives were hindrances rather than helps. But had they been allowed to remain in their monasteries to *pray* they would have accomplished marvels, as is evident from the fact that, despite victory after victory by de Montfort's troops, the heresy lived on until St. Dominic received,

as pious tradition tells us, the revelation of the Rosary from Our Lady. Then things changed! For *prayer,* omnipotent prayer, had been added to soldiers' arms and preachers' words. The heresy was soon repressed and gradually disappeared. Prayer proved of more avail than the might of arms.

Do understand me, Most Holy Father. I am not of that extreme school which tries to maintain that prayer is everything. It is not! Both Simon de Montfort and St. Dominic were needed in that 13th Century; Simon to wield the sword, Dominic to sinew his arm by prayer. I am, however, of that school which insists that arms without prayer, and even preaching without prayer, will prove ineffectual—and history bears me out.

Think of Lepanto and Don John of Austria. Pope St. Pius V saw that battle "as in a mirror" from his chapel in far-off Rome. He saw "the last knight of Christendom" break the battle-line, and, for the first time in history, defeat the infidel at sea. But St. Pius V, saw more than Don John and his gallant men that morning. He saw Confraternities of the Rosary, the world over—*praying!* For it was "Rosary Sunday"—Oct. 7, 1571. The saintly Pontiff commemorated that triumph rightly by honoring Don John of Austria and *Our Lady of Victory.* For her he commanded an annual commemoration which we celebrate today on the first Sunday in October under the title of "Our Lady of the Rosary," as St. Pius' successor, Gregory XIII, demanded. These Pontiffs knew that it was *prayer* that had strengthened the arms of the warriors.

Think again of Vienna and John Sobieski. A little more than a century had passed since the victory of Lepanto, when the Ottoman was again at Europe's gate, pounding at the bastions of Christian civilization. But Christendom still had a soul of chivalry. On Sunday, Sept. 12, 1683, John Sobieski served Mass, received Holy Communion, then with the cry: *Non nobis, Domine, non nobis; sed nomini tuo da gloriam,* led that immortal charge which broke forever the might of the Ottoman. Montaigne was right when he called Vienna "one of the four most beautiful victories the sun ever shone upon." But Innocent XI was even more right when he commemorated the victory by extending the Feast of the Most Holy Name of Mary to the universal Church; for he knew it was *prayer* to the Queen of Peace that had nerved Sobieski to the charge.

You will remember that less than a lifetime later, Clement XI was taking pattern from his predecessors, and was thanking the proper person for another astounding victory over the infidel. On Aug. 5, 1716, the Feast of Our Lady of the Snows, Prince Eugene of Austria met the Turks at Peterwardein and crushed them completely. But the Holy Pontiff laid the standards taken by Eugene at the feet of Our Lady; for he had implored her help even before he had sent a legate to any of the courts of Europe. He knew that arms were essential. He knew something equally, if not more, essential—*prayer!*

Of course You may tell me that the battering-ram and the battle-axe have long given place to the "sword of the spirit." I know that, Most Holy Father; but I also know that as the nineteenth century died, a great Pontiff, Leo XIII, showed us how to bring erring man back to "the paths consecrated by the Blood of the God-man and the tears of His holy Mother." It was by the use of *prayer!* His *Magnae Dei Matris* was a call to a Crusade. In it he repeated what he had stated so forcefully a year earlier in his Encyclical *Octobri mense;* namely, that "*prayer* has always been the *principal* force of the Church"—especially prayer to Mary by use of the Rosary.

Leo XIII needed no special revelation to come to that conclusion. The simplest Christian can think no otherwise when he hears Christ Himself command us to *pray* always; sees Him with the busy, ever-helpful Martha and the silent, contemplative Mary, yet, insisting that "Mary has chosen the better part," watches Him pray before His most striking miracles; and learns that "being in an agony, He prayed the longer." Then the least thoughtful of men cannot miss the timeliness of Christ's words to the Apostles, baffled by their inability to cast out a certain demon. "This kind" said Christ, "is not cast out except by *prayer* and penance." Don't You think, Most Holy Father, that our world is possessed by "this kind" of a devil?

Pius XI thought so, and said so on more than one occasion. That is why in his Apostolic Constitution *Umbratilem* of July 8, 1924, he wrote: "If ever it were needful that there be those in the Church who embrace the purely contemplative life, surely it is most specially expedient today. . . . It is impossible that these religious, keeping their Rule not only exactly but with real fervor, should not

become and remain powerful pleaders with Our Most Merciful God for all Christendom. . . . They who fulfill the duty of prayer and penance contribute *much more* to the increase of the Church and the welfare of mankind than those who labor in tilling the Master's field."

That statement staggers. I know You may be tempted to point out to me that this Apostolic Constitution is nothing but a letter of congratulations to the Carthusians, and that in such a letter statements of this seemingly extravagant nature are to be expected. But, Most Holy Father, if that argument should seem weak because found in a letter of congratulations to contemplatives, what shall we say of it when we find it addressed to foreign missioners? On Feb. 18, 1926, Pius XI, the Pope of Catholic *action,* wrote his *Rerum ecclesiarum gestarum*—an Encyclical on the Foreign Missions. In it he says: "Just as We earnestly beg the Superiors General of such [Cloistered Contemplative] Orders that by the foundation of monasteries, their stricter form of contemplative life may be introduced and widely spread in missionary territories, so likewise, in season and out of season, do We pray you, beloved sons, to interest yourselves therein; for it is marvelous what measures of heavenly grace such solitaries could call down upon your labors . . . it is perfectly clear (from actual experience) that such contemplatives, keeping unbroken the rule and spirit of their Founder, and *taking no part in the active life,* can be daily no small help towards the success of your apostolate."

An exhortation to get as *co-workers* men who were to take "no part *in the active life,*" and yet to insist that they will be "of no small help *daily*" will seem strange only to those unacquainted with man's solidarity in the mystical body of Adam through sin, and in the Mystical Body of Christ through Baptism, Faith and Obedience to His Vicar. It is that double solidarity, Most Holy Father, that moves me to plead with all the force at my command, even as it led Pius XI to write his immortal plea in that heart-moving Encyclical on reparation *Miserentissimus Redemptor* of May 8, 1928. That is one role we cloistered contemplatives can fulfill to perfection. We can be penitents for an unrepentant world. We can be bondsmen and bailmen for our brothers who sin and atone not. We can be health-giving leucocytes in a blood-stream that needs healthy corpuscles badly!

But if there should be any who still question the practicality of the contemplative life when atheistic Communism threatens to engulf the world in its mad conflagration, let them read *Caritate Christi compulsi* of May 3, 1932 and *Divini Redemptoris* of March 19, 1937. Here are two Encyclicals that pulse. Pius XI was holding out the most potent weapons obtainable that we might use them against atheistic Communism. In 1932 he said: "In the face of this satanic hatred of religion. . . We would consider ourselves wanting in our Apostolic ministry if We did not point out to mankind those wonderful mysteries of light that *alone* contain the hidden strength to subjugate the unchained powers of darkness. . . It seems to Us, Venerable Brethren . . . that the evils of our times can be averted *only* by means of *prayer and penance.*" In 1937 he was even more explicit. "The evil that torments humanity today," he wrote, "can be conquered *only* by a worldwide crusade of *prayer and penance.* We especially ask Contemplative Orders, men and women, to redouble their prayers and sacrifices to obtain from Heaven efficacious aid for the Church in the present struggle."

Pius XI is dead, but Communism is not. Can it be because we have not joined that crusade? The Vicar of Christ's call was not enough, so Christ's own Mother came to issue the same command. Our Lady of Fatima urged us to prayer and penance—and to nothing else! For thirty years that motherly plea was left unheeded. But finally Pius XII came forth and consecrated the world to the Immaculate Heart of Mary. The step was slow, but it was not, and is not, too late, provided we give ourselves to *prayer and penance.* Pius XII recognized this, that is why every Peace Message rang with the cry for more prayer and more penance. His Encyclical on St. Benedict of Nursia is one long eulogy on both. But, to me, his most convincing act was one in the description of which I shall have to suppress a few names.

In 1948 a Vicar Apostolic looked out on his mission field and found it "white for the harvest." He looked around at his workers and found few, very few. But then his eyes fell on a Trappist monastery in his Vicariate. There, within that cloister, were forty priests who did nothing but say Mass and sing Office. If he could get those forty, or even fifteen of them, out in his field, what a harvest he would garner! He approached the Abbot and told him the moving truth that thousands of pagans were dying out there

simply for lack of priests. In open honesty he told him if he didn't get helpers he would have to close his missions. The Abbot shook his head. "I'd love to help you," he said, "but I am only a subordinate. Without word from my General or my General Chapter I dare not move—and I doubt that they would give me word."

"If that is all that holds you back," said the Vicar with evident relief, "get ready to move. I am on my way to Rome, I'll get word for you, not from your General or your General Chapter, but from the Pope."

He went to Rome. He saw Pius XII. He told him exactly what he had told the Cistercian Abbot and ended with the same words: "If I do not get helpers from that monastery I will have to close my missions."

The Holy Father sighed deeply then said: "If that is the case, close your missions. Those monks are not to leave their cloister. It is behind their walls they are most effective, not elsewhere."

It is that short but most penetrating statement that recalls to me the most perfect apologia I ever heard for the Contemplative life. It is contained in two brief sentences. Two questions that allow of only one answer. The apologist looked at his Catholic adversary who was decrying the cloistered life, as so many of our ill-instructed Catholics will do. "You believe in the efficacy of prayer, don't you?" he asked pointedly. To that question the weakest and worst of Catholics has only one answer. When this one had given it, the apologist closed his perfect apologia with: "Then what's wrong with a *whole life of prayer?*"

I know You believe in the efficacy of prayer, Most Holy Father, so I beg You to leave us in our monasteries. Leave us to our contemplation. Leave these mortals of a few short years, these creatures of clay, on their crosses of molten iron that we may burn on until we burn out for Him and for all those for whom He burnt Himself out. Do leave us in the one milieu in which we can be efficacious for the glory of God and the salvation of our sin-sodden world. Leave us in our cloisters.

There is yet one argument, Most Holy Father. It was written by God Himself on the plains at Raphidim and the hilltop nearby. Lest it be lost to posterity God the Holy Ghost sphered it in infallibility by having it written into the seventeenth chapter of the

Book of Exodus. It is there for all to read and to learn that prayer is *so* essential for any victory!

Amalec came to fight the Israelites. Moses told Josue to go out and fight the enemy while he with Aaron and Hur retired to the neighboring hilltop. They went there not to observe the battle; not to direct the warring hosts; but *to pray!* God the Holy Ghost tells us that "when Moses lifted up his hands Israel overcame; but if he let them down a little, Amalec overcame!" With that before You perhaps You will see that instead of urging us out into the world, You should be sending other Aarons and Hurs into the cloister to support our prayer-weary hands. For then it will come to pass that, even as with Moses, our hands "will not weary until sunset," and other Josues will "put Amalec and his people to flight!"

As a final and—to me—devastating plea, may I dare to beg Your Holiness to be good to God? In a day when what is called a country but in reality is a continent (and threatens to become two continents even as it desires to become the world!) denies God His very existence; in a day when what we feared for decades on decades as the "yellow peril" is upon us and proves to be more "red" than yellow, and to religion and religious is proving more deadly than any "Black Death" or "White Plague"; at a time when the world which was made to be the very mirror of God's majesty is nothing but shattered glass whose ten thousand times ten thousand jagged pieces image only man's distorted features, cold with the cruelty of ugly hates or streaming with the sweats of hideous lusts; at a time when what should have been a burnished brazier from whose wide open throat clouds, dense with white worship and heavy with the scent of adoring love, should endlessly arise has become a stench-filled Gehenna whose glooms befoul the heavens and sicken the very sun; at such a time, let us maintain our tiny monasteries that in the black-out of the modern world sudden jets of anxious sparks shall shatter the night, gold with adoration of our All-perfect God and fiery red with awe and admiration of His majesty. Do, Most Holy Father, do let God have some lovers who can devote their entire lives directly and exclusively to Him *alone!*

M. Raymond, O.C.S.O.

The Abbey of Our Lady of Gethsemani
Nelson County, Ky.

THE HOSPITAL CHAPLAIN AND MARRIAGE PROBLEMS

In the course of his ministerial activities the hospital chaplain frequently encounters cases involving matrimonial problems. No priest could be expected to be able to solve all these problems immediately. Some of them are so complicated that even experienced theologians and canonists could not give a decision without considerable study. On the other hand, the priest habitually engaged in hospital work should be sufficiently familiar with the teachings of theology and canon law and with their practical applications to be capable of deciding quickly what should be done in the matrimonial cases that are met more commonly among the patients. At times even a brief delay may mean that a sick or dying person is deprived of advice or spiritual help which he has urgently sought in the present crisis and which may be vitally important for the welfare of his soul.

The cases presented to the hospital chaplain may concern matters connected with married life, such as contraception, separation of husband and wife, the bringing up of the children, etc., or they may refer to the marriage bond itself. It is this latter category that concerns us now. Generally speaking, cases of this nature fall into two classes. The first involves couples who are living in an invalid conjugal union, which cannot be rectified—at least in the immediate future. Usually it is the case of a sick person who has been divorced and civilly remarried (or has civilly married a divorced person), while the previous partner is still alive. The patient wishes to receive the sacraments—perhaps he is in imminent danger of death. What can and should the priest do in such a situation?

The ordinary course of action is to exact from the sick person a promise that he will not resume conjugal relations with his partner and will even dwell under a different roof in the future. This procedure must be followed when it is publicly known that the couple are not recognized by the Catholic Church as husband and wife, as is the case when the divorce and the remarriage took place in the same locality, even though many years have passed since these occurrences. Furthermore, if time permits, the sick person must be required before the priest hears his confession to attest

before witnesses (at least two) that he repents of his sin and will effect a separation if he recovers.[1] Of course this presupposes that the priest becomes aware of the existing condition before the patient makes his confession. If the discovery is made only when the sick person goes to confession, the priest may not give him absolution unless he promises to reveal the matter outside the sacrament and make a formal retraction as described. If there is reason to doubt the sincerity of this promise, the confessor should withhold absolution until the statement has been made.

Such is the ordinary procedure to be followed when the sick person is involved in an invalid union which cannot be rectified. However, it can happen that the couple are commonly thought to be actually husband and wife. It may be that they themselves are the only persons in the locality who are aware of the true character of their union, and there is no reason to fear that the public will find out their secret. Such would be the case if one of them had been previously married in a foreign country, and this fact is utterly unknown in the place of his present abode. In such an event, it may be permitted to them to resume their common dwelling, but on the basis of brother and sister, particularly if there are young children whom they must rear, provided adequate assurance is given that they will remain continent. If the confessor is quite sure that the patient will never be sufficiently well to return home (even though death is not imminent) it will suffice for the reception of absolution that the patient alone promise sincerely to abstain from all sinful association with the other party, even though this latter does not give any consent to this arrangement. But if there is any probability that the patient will recover, the consent of both parties to the brother-sister arrangement must be procured before absolution is imparted, apart from the exceptional case of a person whose determination to abide by God's law is so firm and unqualified that the confessor is morally certain that the danger of sinful cohabitation will be removed, even though the other party does not consent. As is evident, if the matter is revealed in the sacramental tribunal, the penitent must consent to the use of the knowledge outside the confessional, supposing that the other party is to be asked to agree to the brother-sister mode of cohabitation. Moreover, if the local

[1] Cf. Damen, *Theologia moralis* (Rome, 1947), II, n. 492.

ordinary has made any ruling on the matter, the priest must see to it that this is observed.

A difficult situation is created when the other party of an invalid union which must be broken wishes to visit the sick person. For, marks of affection, thoughts and desires, which are likely to be occasioned by such a visit, would be a strong inducement to sin. The other party should be advised gently and courteously not to visit the sick room; but if this is not feasible, the sick person should be admonished that neither externally nor internally may he treat the visitor as a married partner.

Is it ever allowed to leave a person in good faith regarding the continuance of a marital union which the priest knows to be invalid, and (at least at present) incapable of being validated? Theologians commonly teach that in exceptional circumstances this is permissible. The case would occur when the impediment is of a private nature, not recognized as an impediment by the couple, or at least not by the one who is seeking the priest's ministrations. The priest has a good reason to fear that if they (or he) were informed that their marriage is invalid, they would nevertheless not separate. Impotence which was permanent even at the time of the marriage would be the most common example of such an impediment. It is possible that the priest may accidentally discover from the patient's confession that his marriage is invalid on this account, but that complete good faith prevails in both (or at least in the party now seeking the sacraments). In such an event, the rule laid down by Prümmer would be applicable: "If the parties are in good faith, they are not to be disturbed, if from the dissolution of the marriage great inconveniences are to be feared or if there is little hope that they will live chastely as brother and sister." [2]

It could happen that the patient has been living in a union that is invalid because of a publicly known impediment, and yet be in good faith. This could occur in the case of a non-Catholic desirous of entering the Church, who has remarried after a divorce and yet entertains the naive idea that his remarriage as a non-Catholic was perfectly lawful or that by entering the Catholic Church his previous matrimonial entanglement is rectified. If the sick person is in his final hours, he could be received into the Church without being disturbed on this matter, with the merely

[2] Prümmer, *Manuale theologiae moralis* (Fribourg Brisgov., 1935), III, n. 802.

general promise that he will fulfill God's law in the future. But if death is not imminent, he should be enlightened and told that he must promise to rectify the situation in the event of a return to his home; otherwise, he cannot be admitted to membership in the Catholic Church. Usually, this means that he must agree to separate from his present partner. However, if a dissolution of the previous bond can probably be effected after his entrance into the Church—for example, through the Pauline privilege—he should be informed of this, though no absolute assurance should be given that he will actually succeed in obtaining it.

The second type of matrimonial problem that comes to the attention of the hospital chaplain concerns the patient whose spiritual welfare would be greatly promoted by immediate marriage. It may be that there is no impediment to the union. The usual example of this is the Catholic who has married another Catholic civilly or before a non-Catholic clergyman, there being no impediment of divine or ecclesiastical law.[3] Now they wish to have the union validated. The procedure to be followed is substantially the same as that observed in the normal Catholic marriage, though certain modifications can be made in view of the fact that one of the parties is hospitalized, particularly if the sick person is in danger of death.

If there is no danger of death, the investigation must be conducted according to the prescriptions of the Code.[4] The baptismal certificate of each of the parties must be obtained from the church of their baptism, the proper inquiries must be made to establish the freedom of both to marry, etc. However, in danger of death, if the usual proofs are lacking, it suffices (unless there are indications to the contrary) that both parties declare under oath that they were baptized and that they are not prevented by any impediment from contracting a valid and lawful marriage.[5] *Per se*, there is an obligation to publish the banns, but usually in the case of marriages in a hospital there is sufficient reason to seek a dispensation from the Ordinary. In urgent cases (particularly in danger

[3] The priest must beware lest he think that when the impediment of *ligamen* has ceased by reason of the death of a previous spouse (who was living at the time of the civil remarriage) there is no longer any impediment to the validation of the present union. The impediment of *crimen* has been contracted, as is declared by Canon 1075, §1.

[4] Cf. Can. 1019 sq.

[5] Cf. Can. 1019, §2.

of death) when recourse to the Ordinary is not possible, the priest can declare that by *epikeia* the obligation to publish the banns has ceased.[6]

The presence of an authorized priest besides two witnesses is *per se* required for the validity of the marriage. If the chaplain happens to be the local pastor, or an assistant in the parish where the hospital is situated, possessing general delegation to assist at marriage either from the local Ordinary or from the pastor, he is empowered to assist as the authorized priest. However, if he is neither pastor nor assistant of the local parish, he must receive delegation—*given to a determined priest for a determined marriage.*[7] This delegation can be procured from the Bishop, Vicar General, the pastor or the curate of the parish in which the hospital is situated. However, in a large hospital where occasions to assist at marriage may frequently occur, it is most practical for the Bishop to appoint the hospital chaplain an assistant in the local parish with respect to assistance at marriage. "This type of assistantship could be given to the hospital chaplain to enable him to have a general delegation to assist at the marriage to be contracted in the hospital, not indeed in his capacity of chaplain but in his capacity as regularly appointed assistant in the parish. This appointment as assistant *ad matrimonium* would not affect the chaplain's independence from the local pastor in other spiritual functions." [8]

Supposing that the chaplain has no authorization, either as pastor, assistant or priest delegated for a particular marriage, there are occasions when he can allow a marriage to take place between two Catholics in the hospital without the presence of an authorized priest. This is a case covered by Canon Law which prescribes that in danger of death, when an authorized priest cannot be procured, marriage can be contracted validly and lawfully before two witnesses. In such a case the chaplain should be present, together with the witnesses, though his presence is not required for validity.[9]

[6] Cf. Ramstein, *The Pastor and Marriage Cases* (New York, 1938), p. 15; De Smet, *De sponsalibus et matrimonio* (Bruges, 1927), n. 61.

[7] Can. 1096.

[8] Drumm, *Hospital Chaplains* (Washington, D. C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1943), p. 134.

[9] Cf. Can. 1098.

The use of the telephone or telegraph to procure an authorized priest or to secure delegation for the chaplain would not be necessary.[10] However, "if through the use of an automobile an authorized priest or authorization for the chaplain can readily be procured and in time, the condition formulated in the clause, *si haberi vel adiri nequeat sine gravi incommodo* of Canon 1098 is surely not present." [11]

However, there may be an impediment to the marriage. The Code has a very wide concession for such an event, expressed in Canons 1043 and 1044. According to the former canon, when for reasons of conscience or for the legitimation of offspring a person in danger of death wishes to be married, the Ordinary can dispense from all the impediments of ecclesiastical law, even multiple, whether public or occult, except the impediment arising from the priesthood, and that arising from affinity in the direct line (presuming that the marriage was consummated). He can also dispense from the prescribed form of marriage. This power extends to all his subjects wherever they may be, and also to all persons actually present in his diocese. According to Canon 1044, the same dispensing power is possessed by a pastor (with respect to his own people, and others actually within the parish) when the Ordinary cannot be reached. It is also possessed in the same circumstances by a priest who assists at a marriage without delegation, as described in Canon 1098, § 2, and by a confessor (though he can exercise it only for the internal forum and in the act of sacramental confession). The most practical application of this canon, as far as the hospital chaplain is concerned, is to seek from the Ordinary the delegation of this wide dispensing power, at least to the extent that it is possessed by a pastor so that it can be used whenever the Ordinary cannot be reached. Such a delegation is actually granted by many of the bishops of the United States to all priests having faculties in their diocese.

If the priest wishes to use this faculty to dispense from the impediment of mixed religion or disparity of cult, he must first demand the usual guarantees—that is, he must receive from the non-Catholic the promise that he will not interfere with the Catholic's practise of religion, and from both the promise that all children who may subsequently be born of the marriage will be

[10] Cf. *AAS*, XIV (1922), 662.

[11] Drumm, *op. cit.*, p. 125.

baptized and brought up in the Catholic Faith. These promises should be given in writing if possible.[12]

Even a deacon could be dispensed from the obligation of celibacy and allowed to marry in accordance with this concession of the Church, if the reasons were present—reasons of conscience or the legitimation of offspring—but he would not thereby be reduced to the lay state, not dispensed from the obligation of Divine Office. However, no power to dispense a priest in such circumstances is granted by the Church. Neither does the dispensing power granted by Canons 1043 and 1044 extend to a *sanatio in radice*—for example, for the benefit of a dying Catholic who has contracted an invalid marriage with a non-Catholic who cannot now be persuaded to renew consent. However, in such circumstances our bishops, by virtue of the quinquennial faculties, can grant a *sanation*.[13]

The chaplain to whom the dispensing power of Canon 1043 or 1044 has been granted should remember that it includes the power to dispense from the prescribed form of matrimony—that is, the presence of witnesses and even of an authorized priest. This is helpful when the invalidity of the marriage is known only to the parties themselves or when the presence of witnesses at the sick bed in a ward would subject the couple to infamy.

If the person whom the patient wishes to marry cannot be present (for example, if he is at a great distance) the marriage can be performed with the aid of a proxy, deputed by the absent party. There might be difficulty in having such a ceremony recognized as a lawful marriage by the civil authorities; but in the event that there has already been a marriage recognized by the state (though not by the Church), this difficulty would have no practical bearing.

It can happen that a sick person wishing to marry has previously attempted marriage to another party which is certainly not recognized as valid by the Church, though as yet there has been no official declaration to this effect. Normally, such a declaration must be obtained before a priest may assist at the person's present marriage, even though he is sure that there was a substantial defect in the previous contract, either because of lack of form or because of some diriment impediment. In the event that there is sufficient time to approach the bishop for a declaration, this must be done.

[12] Cf. Can. 1043, 1061; *AAS*, XXXIV (1942), 22.

[13] Cf. Bouscaren, *Canon Law Digest*, II (Milwaukee, 1943), 32.

But if this is impossible, and there is urgent need for the marriage, it would seem that the priest, acting on *epikeia,* could judge that an official verdict is not needed in this case, and could allow the marriage ceremony to take place. However, it must be emphasized that this can be done only when it is certain that the previous marriage was null and void, and that it has never been rectified. The most usual case would occur when a Catholic party's previous marriage took place before a non-Catholic clergyman or a civil magistrate. Perhaps there could be certainty also if the impediment of consanguinity or affinity were undoubtedly present in the previous marriage. But a priest would be acting very rashly if he attempted to declare a previous marriage bond invalid because of lack of due consent or unjust fear; or if he declared the person free to enter marriage when only circumstantial evidence can be adduced that a previous valid marriage has been dissolved by the death of the other partner. These cases require a thorough investigation before a definite decision can be given, and the priest cannot reasonably regard them as committed to his judgment, even by a wide use of *epikeia.*

The question might be raised as to the validity of a marriage contracted by a man whose physical powers are greatly weakened by an ailment that is surely bringing about his death, yet whose marital union demands rectification. It is an established principle that one who is permanently impotent cannot contract a valid marriage.[14] It might seem therefore, that if a man is so debilitated that he could not perform the essential act of marriage—erection and semination—and it is evident that this condition will not improve before his death, he must be regarded as impotent and incapable of contracting a valid marriage. But, in practice, this objection offers little difficulty, for in the particular circumstances it would be impossible to prove that the sick man has become impotent, and hence the principle laid down in the Code is to be followed: "If the impediment of impotence is doubtful, whether by doubt of law or of fact, the marriage is not to be prevented."[15] In the words of Cardinal Gasparri: "The power to perform the conjugal act still remains, even though the power of illness impedes the act itself. Hence as long as it is not certain that the power itself has not been entirely

[14] Cf. Damen, *op. cit.,* II, n. 713.

[15] Can. 1068, §2.

destroyed, (which can hardly be established with certainty) the marriage must be regarded as valid." [16]

The chaplain must be most exact in recording the marriages at which he has assisted, whether as an authorized priest or as the priest to be summoned as a witness for a marriage in danger of death.[17] This record should be made in the book of marriages kept in the local parish rectory, though it may be convenient for the chaplain also to keep a record of the marriages at which he has assisted in the hospital. He should be sure to find out the place of baptism of Catholic parties, and give this information to the local pastor so that he may transmit thereto the notice of the marriage.[18] Finally, the priest who has used the dispensing power granted him for persons married in danger of death must send to the chancery a record of any dispensations he may have granted for the external forum, and a notation of such dispensation is to be made in the marriage record also.[19]

Other cases likely to occur in the hospital in connection with marriage could doubtless be presented, but it would seem that those treated here are the chief problems. It is quite evident that a considerable knowledge of theology and canon law is required by a hospital chaplain if he wishes to solve even the more common cases correctly and expeditiously. Yet, the fact that thorough and painstaking study of theological and canonical teaching on this subject is called for does not excuse the priest from the obligation of making himself familiar with this teaching, so that when a case suddenly arises he may know exactly what can and should be done. Knowledge and efficiency in the handling of such cases will enable the priest to rectify unions that were sinful for many years and to make easier the way to eternal salvation for many immortal souls.

The Catholic University of America
Washington, D. C.

FRANCIS J. CONNELL, C.SS.R.

[16] Gasparri, *De matrimonio* (Rome, 1932), I, n. 544.

[17] Can. 1103.

[18] Cf. Drumm, *op. cit.*, p. 130.

[19] Cf. Can. 1046.

RATUM NON CONSUMMATUM

Part IV

Alice Brownell Fairchild insisted that she and her flyer had never had a chance even to share the same room alone together, let alone the same bed. During the short leave he had been able to get at her station he had had a room in B.O.Q. where he could visit with some of his former ship-mates while she was on duty. She herself had continued to share a room with her close friend, Esther Strang, in the nurses' quarters at the hospital.

Life on that small island had been so closed in upon all of them that she and Jim had never really had a chance to be alone together. They had gone out on picnics, it was true, but there was always somebody else wandering about the island, so that they did not really feel that they could do any more than just have a picnic. They had petted some, of course, but that was as far as they were ever able to go, for they never knew when somebody would come along.

It was true that one of the other girls had offered one night to take Alice's place on duty, but when she had looked at the poor girl she just didn't have the heart to accept that offer. Besides, Jim, she knew, was by that time having a grand party with his old buddies, and she felt that he would be somewhat surprised, after resigning himself to the fact that she had to be on duty, if she showed up and interrupted the bull-session. By the time the offer was made she was quite certain that the men would already have lined up quite a number of dead soldiers and would be more annoyed than anything else if a mere wife butted in on their conversation. She put off the thought, thinking that sometime during the day it might be possible for them to be alone together, when Jim would be sober. Those daytimes, however, were always taken up with other people crowding in.

She was quite certain that they had never had intercourse, for they had never had so much to drink when they were alone together that she did not know what was happening.

It was not a question of illness on the part of either one preventing their having relations. She thought that Jim would have been perfectly capable of consummating the marriage, and she was certain that she was capable. At this point, the judge recalled,

she had hesitated as if for the first time it had occurred to her that perhaps the reason why Jim now wanted her to be free was that he had been injured in such a way that he would no longer be capable of marriage. She had seemed to indicate that that thought was in her mind, but she had not really expressed it, so far as the record showed. In case she should have to be called back to give further testimony, the judge resolved to ask if that suspicion had come to her. He made a note to ask that, just in case the opportunity should present itself.

Just as she had said before, they had never shared the same room alone together, let alone the same bed. They had simply had "dates," if one cared to put it that way during the time that he had had leave while she was at that station.

He had had to return to his carrier when the ten days were up, and she had continued to work at the hospital. It was not that they wanted to be separated, but in war people did not have much choice about where they would be or what they would do. She had tried not to cry when she saw him off, and had succeeded quite well, though when he was out of sight she had broken down. Good old Esther had been there, fortunately, to take her back to quarters and to help her to snap out of it in time to go on duty with a fairly cheerful expression so that the patients in the ward would not be depressed. After all, it was her private grief and it would not be fair to them to make them feel bad, too.

She did not know how Jim had felt at the parting. He had laughed and joked and had waved gaily to her as he got into the boat. He had immediately started a conversation with some of the other flyers who were being ferried out to the ship, and had only once looked back to wave to her as she stood on the jetty. She was not even sure that he was thinking of her at that moment. After all, he was a fighting man and when there was a chance to get back into action there was no holding him.

There had been no civil ceremony for their wedding. The only wedding ceremony had been that by the chaplain in the station chapel. Here, the judge remembered, she had acted a bit surprised that the court could suppose that there had been any but a Catholic ceremony when they were both Catholics. She did not realize, of course, what meaning would have been attached to a situation in

which a previous civil ceremony was later convalidated by a religious ceremony.

There had been a civil divorce, as they presumably already knew. She had obtained it because the doctors had told her that it would help to ease Jim's mind if she did, for he wanted so very much to see her free from him. They had somehow worked out some grounds on which the divorce could be granted, and the decree had become final some two years ago. That had all happened before she had met her present boy-friend, Ed.

Alice did not know whether Jim had talked about their marital troubles to anyone. She herself had talked with Esther, of course, while they were still rooming together at the hospital on the station, so Esther would know about that part of it. Since she had returned stateside, she had had no one to whom to talk about her marriage troubles. She had written to Esther at the time of the divorce, for she had felt that she just must confide in someone, but that was all. Her parents know only that she had married Jim, and that for a long time she had tried to locate him after the letters had stopped coming, and that finally there had been a divorce. They had not approved of the divorce, she knew, but they had not said much about it. She imagined that they felt it was up to her to stick by her man when he was crippled in the war, and she had not wanted to tell them that it was he who no longer wanted her.

The first one who had told her that there was such a thing as a dispensation from a marriage which had been entered into but never consummated was Fr. Brockheim. He had explained it to her when she went to see him on the advice of the chaplain at the hospital where she was now working. She had explained her case to him and had asked him whether there was anything which could be done. She had heard of people who got their marriages annulled and she had thought that maybe there would be something which could be done for her, but Fr. Brockheim had explained that there did not seem to be any way in which her marriage could be annulled. He had said, however, that it might be possible to obtain this dispensation. She had not understood at first, but after he had explained it she had hoped that it might be granted so that she would be free to marry Ed.

The reasons why she wanted the dispensation were that Jim absolutely refused to have anything to do with her so that there was

no hope whatsoever of reconciliation with him. She was even afraid to go back to the hospital to see him, for fear it would make his condition worse. She had written to the hospital from time to time, but her letters had gone unanswered, and finally she had received a note from one of the doctors asking her not to write any more because Jim just got more upset when he received a letter from her. She hoped the Church would not have to bother him, because she did not want him hurt any more than he was already.

As he reflected on that part of her statement, the judge decided that in approaching Jim the court would have to realize that they were probably dealing with a psychopathic case. His reactions toward Alice were hardly normal, to say the least.

Another reason why she wanted the dispensation was that she was still young, and it was not easy to know Ed and like him so much and still try to do what was right. They both knew that they could not let themselves go when they were out together, for they were both Catholics; but it was not easy to have dates together and be so much in love and still keep things under control. She might, of course, break off with Ed, but she was still young and there might be other young men who would come along and be attractive to her, and then it would be the same thing all over again.

Furthermore, Ed was a Catholic boy and a good one. It was not easy for a girl to find a boy who had those qualifications and who was free to marry. So many whom she had met just did not come up to the standard, and the rest had all been married. She did so hope that it would be possible to marry him, for he met all the requirements of her ideal which she had cherished in her heart for as long as she could remember. She had thought that Jim would be that ideal, but that was all over now, and since Ed had come along she did hope that she would not have to give him up.

Alice repeated that she had not been in touch with Jim for a long time, so she did not know how he had reacted to her petition for a dispensation from their marriage vows. She thought that he would be in favor of her getting the dispensation, for it fitted in with what he had said at the time he was demanding that she get the divorce precisely so that she would not be tied any longer to him. She did not think that he would oppose her in any way, for she was only doing what he had wanted all along. He must have realized

that, being a Catholic just as much as he was, she would not consider the divorce given in the civil court as freeing her to contract a new marriage even though that was what he had said that he wanted. He must have realized that the Church would have to pass on the matter before she could really feel free.

The petitioner had then named seven persons who could be called as witnesses "of the seventh hand" (*septimae manus*) who were related to her by ties of blood or marriage, two of them; the other five were neighbors and acquaintances. These people had some knowledge of her case, though they had obtained their information from what she had told them about it. She did not think that they knew too much about it, for she had not felt like talking much, but they could at least testify as to her character, and especially as to whether they believed that she was telling the truth in the present controversy.

Alice also named as many people as she could who were related to Jim or who had been friends of his for a long time and who could give the same sort of information for his side of the case. These names the *Officialis,* as he read over her testimony, noted and put one side to be checked against the list which would come in from Jim when he was interrogated. It might be useful, he thought, to see whether the two lists corresponded, and to what extent. Alice's list in this regard was short. She knew but three or four names, for, after all, her acquaintance with Jim had been of but short duration, and those whom she knew who knew him were mostly people in the service, several of whom were now dead. They had been too engrossed in each other, evidently, to talk much about the people they had known back home, so she was not able to furnish much of a list of names of people who could be *septimae manus* witnesses for him.

Mrs. Fairchild had brought with her to the hearing some letters and other documents which had not been presented with her petition. She had handed these to the Notary at this point in her statement, the judge noted. She had also said that there were one or two other letters at home which she had not brought, but would send in to the court as soon as she got home. The decree of civil divorce had been presented with her petition and she acknowledged it when the Notary showed it to her in the court-room.

She told the court that there had been no physical examination

at the time of the proceedings in the civil court. They had accepted her statement that the marriage had never been consummated without any question. They had been concerned more with the problem whether there were grounds for divorce than with the problem whether the marriage could be annulled because it had never been consummated.

On referring to the documents which Alice had presented to show what had been done in the civil court, the judge found that she had, indeed, in her bill for divorce mentioned the non-consummation of the marriage. That point, however, had not been contested, it appeared, in the course of the trial, so there was no way to tell what, if anything, the court had found out about the truth of that assertion.

Alice had offered to get the records of the physical examinations which she had undergone while she was in the corps. These might throw some light on her statement as to non-consummation. At least, they were records which would indicate what had been discovered at one time in her life. It was, furthermore, a time which would not be suspect, for at that time there was hardly a chance that she was contemplating this petition for a dispensation from her marriage vows on the grounds that the marriage had never been consummated. She had been directed to procure and present authentic copies of those records.

The records would be all the more important in the present case because Alice had said that she was no longer intact. She was willing to submit to a physical examination, if that were required, but she did not think that it would help much; for one day, when she had been riding to an out-lying station, she had been thrown from the jeep as it rounded a bend in the road and crashed into another coming from the opposite direction.

She had been thrown clear, but the road was on the side of a cliff and she had finally landed on a small ledge some ten or twelve feet below the roadway. She had sustained two broken ribs, a broken hip, and a cracked pelvis. They had told her, too, that the maidenhead was torn. All this would be on her records, she was certain. If there had to be a physical examination to determine whether there were physical signs of virginity she was willing to submit to it; but that was what they would find.

This accident, Alice said, had occurred after Jim had gone to

sea again after their last visit together. She did not think that he knew anything about it, for while he was away fighting she had not wanted to write about it. She had been in the hospital, but he would, of course, not have thought anything about her writing from the hospital, for all her letters were from there. She had simply tried to go on being cheerful, filling her letters with funny stories about life around the hospital as she had always done.

When he had wanted her to get the divorce because she should not be tied to a mere wreck of a man she had almost told him of her own injuries, but had held back because she did not want him to get to worrying about her when he had so many worries of his own already.

Esther had been moved away from the station before the accident had occurred, so all she would know about it was what Alice had written to her. That was one of the things which had made it hard, to lie there in the hospital worrying about what might be happening to Jim without even Esther to talk to. Had she been there it would not have been nearly so hard.

This was a fine situation, the *Officialis* thought to himself. Here he had a case of asserted non-consummation in which both of the parties wanted the same thing so that one would have to be especially careful to guard against collusion. That usually meant that one had to be very careful in the interrogation of the witnesses proposed by each party. In this case, however, the marriage and the possibilities of marital life had taken place so far away that the witnesses who could be questioned were not in a position to know much about the situation. To make matters worse, the physical signs of virginity in the woman were admittedly gone, though the records might show when they were destroyed and how.

Even with regard to the witnesses "of the seventh hand" who were to testify as to the character and trustworthiness of the parties there was a difficulty, for they would have to testify from knowledge acquired before these people had gone to war and after they had returned. They would not really know just what they could be expected to do under the stress of war and love on a Pacific island. The *Officialis* sighed and shook his head, thinking that there must be easier jobs than trying to decide a case like this.

In the meantime, however, it would be necessary to send a rogatory commission to the diocese in which was situated the

hospital where Jim stayed. The Defender of the Bond was probably even now going over the statement of Alice very carefully as he prepared the list of questions which he wanted the tribunal of that diocese to put to Jim. Alice's suggestion that she hoped Jim would not have to be bothered, even if it was sincere, could certainly not be accepted in a case like this. It would be essential to learn from the man himself just what had happened on those picnics which she had mentioned.

The next morning the Defender appeared at the office with his list of questions prepared in a sealed envelope for transmission to the diocese where the tribunal would question Jim. The *Officialis* dictated the letter requesting the co-operation of that tribunal, signed it, and watched the Notary sign it and affix the seal of the court before delivering it to the courier to be sent by registered mail.

In due course a letter came back with the answers which Jim had given to the questions prepared by the Defender. There had been no difficulty whatsoever, the tribunal of the other diocese said, in getting Jim to answer the questions. He had, in fact, been most anxious to co-operate in the matter. Realizing the necessity for removing all possibility of collusion the members of the tribunal had, therefore, added such questions as they thought necessary or useful to guard against such collusion. These questions were to be found in the transcript of his testimony with the notation *"ex officio."*

Reading over Jim's testimony the *Officialis* noted approvingly that the correspondent court had attempted to effect a reconciliation in the case; but as was to be expected, if Alice's story was true, that was impossible. Jim's answer to this suggestion bore out completely her assertion that there was no longer any hope of getting these parties back together again. Jim was quite willing to admit that Alice was a nice girl, but he did not want to be married to her any longer. After all, there was but little that he was good for, and he felt it was unfair to keep her chained to him. He admitted that she had wanted to remain married to him despite his injuries and that he had insisted that she get the divorce. He was quite happy if she was now going to be free to marry in the Church, for he know how much it would mean to her not to be outside the Church.

According to the report of the judge who had asked the questions,

he had not insisted too long upon this matter of reconciliation, for he had noticed that Jim was becoming restless at the idea, and he had wanted to get the answers to the other questions before the party would have to leave.

Jim did not know Fr. Brockheim, but he thought that the petition which had been drawn up was an accurate statement of the facts. He was glad that Alice had found someone to help her with the case. The reasons which she had given for seeking the dispensation looked good to him, too.

He admitted that he knew what a "dispensation" meant in this sort of case, for he had asked the Catholic chaplain at the hospital after he got the notice of the petition and the summons to tell his side of the story. At first he had thought that it was an annulment which she was seeking, but the chaplain had explained the difference and he could see the point. Some of the other patients had said that in a regular court it would be an annulment, and that was where he had got the idea that it was an annulment that she was after. It did not really matter much, of course, so long as she was free.

They had met in the hospital at the over-seas base, he recalled, while he was laid up after the first Jap had got him. She was always pleasant and cheerful and good-looking. Hospital romances were impermanent things at best, he knew, so he merely tried to play up and be cheerful without becoming serious, but before he had realized it he was getting anxious to see her come on duty in the ward. When she went off duty, or even when she left the ward for a few minutes, he missed her more and more.

When he had been able to get out and could think about a date he had quite naturally asked Alice. She had been free at the time and had accepted. This had pleased him greatly, but then he had wondered whether she had said "yes" merely because he was still not discharged from the hospital and was therefore a patient to be cared for. That thought had bothered him for some time, until he had discovered that she seemed to care for him even as he did for her.

They had not had much time to get acquainted with each other, really, and maybe it was imprudent to marry under the pressure of war. It certainly seemed so when you looked back on it after it was all over. You never knew what was going to happen in war. If

you got killed that was not so bad, for it was all over and the other person might be broken up for a while but then she would get over it and start life anew. The trouble was that you could not be sure when you got it that that would be the end. You might wind up a cripple, unable to take care of anybody.

At any rate they had got themselves married by the padre there in the chapel at the hospital. There had not been much chance to fix things up as a bride should have them, but they had done what they could with the help of his friends and hers. The padre had been swell about it and had got things through as quickly as he could.

Their parents knew that they were getting married, because both he and she had written to them. He did not know her people, and she had never met his, so far as he knew, unless she had after she came home. They weren't kids, anyhow; and it was up to them to decide whether or not they cared enough for each other to get married.

Jim recalled that they had gone from the chapel to the Club for the wedding breakfast. It wasn't the sort of thing he would have ordered back in the States, but out on an island in wartime everybody had said that it was wonderful. At least there had been some liquor and the boys had done their best to get him tight, he said with a chuckle. They hadn't known Jim Fairchild!

With the celebration going on and everybody coming over to congratulate them they had not realized how the time was passing. That order canceling all leaves had caught them unawares. The *Officialis* noted that Jim seemed to recall the order as having come through while the wedding party was still celebrating in the Club, whereas Alice had said that it had come through while they were in their respective quarters packing to go on their honeymoon. Apparently a question as to where they were at the time when the order came through would have been in order. As Jim told the story they had had even less opportunity to be alone together, for in his version they had not been able to get away from the Club until it was time to go aboard ship. While they were at the Club, of course, the crowd present had prevented any consummation of the marriage.

Jim further corroborated Alice's story about the exchange of letters during their separation and about the difficulty of arranging

leaves so that they could have some time to be together. His ship had moved out to repulse an attack that first time. Damaged in the fight, it had been forced to put in for repairs at a port quite distant from the island where Alice was stationed. He had tried his best to wangle a ride with NATS to visit her, but there had been nothing going that way, at least nothing that he could get on.

At sea again his carrier had moved up on one attack after another and it had been impossible during the brief periods when it had put into port to get transportation to Alice's island. They just didn't have any luck at all, it seemed. That was why it was wrong, he thought, for a couple to get married in wartime. You were married, but that was all the good it did you.

It had come as quite a surprise to him when they found themselves once more in the vicinity of Alice's island. Almost unbelievably, they had put in there and he had been able to see her again. She was so glad to see him, too, that he knew she must have missed him terribly, just as her letters had said she did. Even so, it was still that war, and casualties had so filled her hospital that the girls were all overworked and she could not get off duty except during the daytime. He had understood when she explained that she could not ask one of the other girls to work a double shift. He wouldn't have asked a tired buddy to make an extra flight for him, either. That was one of the nice things about Alice, she did her job even if she didn't like it at times.

He had been assigned a room in B.O.Q. and, surprisingly enough, had there run across some of his ship-mates from the first carrier he had served on, the time he got hit and went to the hospital for the first time and met Alice. They had had a lot of fun talking over the experiences they had had since they had parted. It had made the time away from Alice go faster, and it was good to see them again, anyway.

It had been one of those fellows who had managed to get him and Alice a jeep to use one day so they could go on a picnic. Some of the other officers who had been on the island longer knew of good spots to which they could drive. He had known some himself, once, when he had been there before, but he had not been sure whether he could remember how to get there.

Once they came around the turn in the road, however, he knew exactly where they were. It was the same spot where he had

proposed to Alice and she had said yes. They had stopped and climbed down to the beach with their picnic gear, laughing gaily as they remembered all that the spot meant to them. There had been nothing in the whole wide world but the two of them and soon he had taken Alice in his arms.

Shouts from the roadway above them, however, had brought them back to reality as two more couples had slid down the incline to join them, to kid them, and to challenge them to another dip in the ocean. The mood had been broken then. Maybe it was just as well, Jim thought, for if Alice had become pregnant it would have been even harder for her. It was bad enough for her to be on her own now, but it would be even worse if she were left with a child to support. He hadn't liked the intrusion at the time, but, thinking back on it, he guessed it was all for the best.

(*To be continued*)

THOMAS OWEN MARTIN

The Catholic University of America
Washington, D. C.

THE AMERICAN BISHOPS AND THE HOLY SEE

He is a schismatic and prevaricator who attempts to establish any other Chair in opposition to the Roman See, or independent of it. That Church was consecrated by the martyrdom of the apostles Peter and Paul, who bequeathed to her their whole doctrine with their blood. Christ our Lord has placed the doctrine of truth in the Chair of unity, and has charged Peter and his successors to confirm their brethren, having prayed specially that the faith of Peter may not fail. By means of the uninterrupted tradition of that Church, coming down through the succession of bishops from the apostles, we confound those who through pride, self-complacency, or any other perverse influence, teach otherwise than divine revelation warrants, and attempt to adulterate the doctrine, which, as pure streams from an unpolluted fountain, flows thence throughout the whole world.

—"The Pastoral Letter of 1849," published in Msgr. Peter Guilday's edition of *The National Pastorals of the American Hierarchy* (Washington: NCWC, 1923), pp. 174 f.

THE PRIEST IN RADIO

Part IV

THE PRIEST AS RADIO PRODUCER AND DIRECTOR

Since many priests conduct programs of their own, or have the opportunity of setting up local Catholic programs which will employ the talents of other priests or laymen, it is necessary to discuss the priest in his role of radio producer and director.

People often ask the question, "Just what does a radio producer do?" The answer that most often comes to my mind is: "He is the man who has most of the headaches with a show." But this, of course, is an oversimplification. To enlarge on it a bit, we might say that he is the man responsible for seeking out talent, planning the program's format, handling the detail work with regard to script, its editing and clearance, supervising the music, and often writing continuity for the show. He puts the show together, and sees that everything is ready for it to go on the air as a complete package. Since he deals with all sorts of personalities, talents, and temperaments, he must try as well as he can, to be kind, tactful, diplomatic, and firm—all at the same time.

Besides, he must know what makes a program "click" with the listeners. In other words, he must know radio and like it so well that he eats it, sleeps it, and dreams about it. Heaven knows, he will talk about it to anybody who will listen, especially to other radio men.

Now the religious radio producer must have all these qualities of a radio man, but he must have something more too. He should be fired with a genuine love for this sort of apostolate. He must realize that every word he writes, every time he gets a better mike set-up for a choir, he is doing it not only for the good of the show but so that the message of the program—God's message, no less—is put forth as effectively and as perfectly as possible, even down to the last smallest detail. People often say that "the audience will never know the difference. Only you radio men, who watch everything in a studio like a hawk, and listen with the utmost attention, will realize what was lacking in the show." That, of course, is generally true. The audience will not be aware of every fluff and clinker, but if there are enough of them, the audience will feel that

something is wrong, and will be disturbed. It will not know why it was disturbed or dissatisfied with the program, but the subtle feeling will persist. And that isn't good.

There are many priests, too, who have charge of perhaps three or four programs in their areas. These men then are not only radio producers but have under their direction a whole series of programs.

It is frequently, as it should be, their duty also to keep an eye on the general radio picture of their areas—to seek time for Catholic programs from stations that are opening up in the community, and to aid in publicizing the Catholic programs on the air.

Planning the Program

Let us assume that a radio station in your community asks you, as a representative of the Catholic Church in your area, to take the air for, say, fifteen minutes a week. Assuming of course, that all necessary clearances have been obtained from the chancery office of the diocese, what happens next?

If there are other priests in the community who are interested in radio, and who are willing to co-operate in putting on a program, the burden is somewhat lightened. Then there is talent available, and the whole job will not fall on one man.

First, he has to decide what he wants to do with the time—not just fill it, but use it most effectively.

I think he should first consult with the station executives as to what they have found out about the tastes of the community. Do the people like music, and what kinds—classical, swing, semi-classical? Do the listeners show a preference for, let us say, forum type programs as opposed to straight talks? What are the chief occupations of the community? In an industrial community, it would not do to stress the problems of the farmer all the time. What are the problems of the community? Is it afflicted with labor problems? Is it disturbed about some civic reforms—a new gas works, a new water works? Perhaps the question uppermost in the people's minds is nothing greater than a controversy over whether the town shall install parking meters. There can be an awful lot of controversy over that.

In other words, the producer should feel out the temper of the people of the community. They will be his listeners. He must

capture them, and he must instruct them. Once he knows the tastes, occupations, and habits of the people he will be reaching, the radio producer will get some notion of the kind of show he wants to produce.

He may find it apparent, in view of his research into these matters, that a straight talk and music program would be less effective than a show that would use contrasting voices. Of course he may not have much to work with, but perhaps he can get some other priest or a Catholic layman to go on the program with him, and arrange a discussion-type program. Admittedly, there can be no argument about whether or not there is a God. But between the two speakers, the Catholic ideas about God can be brought out. If the community is conscious of labor problems, a program of this type could underline the Catholic teaching on capital and labor. One really ought to call such a program a feeling-out process between two minds, rather than a discussion.

The program idea should be so flexible that it can include from time to time appearances on the air of guests who can be interviewed by the priest program director. An outstanding Catholic speaker visits the community for a public lecture. Invite him to appear as a guest on the program. A well-known public figure visits the community. Invite him. The producer will have to talk over with the guest just what questions he is going to ask and in general, how the answers will come out. But if he ties up the interview with some local question or some local interest, he will be doing the community a service and at the same time be putting the Church and her teachings forward.

Many other programs of local community interest can be worked out. In every part of our country, there is a wealth of local history. The story of the monument in the public square can be linked up with some observations on Christian ideals. The story of the pioneer founders of the community can be made the basis of a presentation on self-abnegation, and then the supernatural view of this virtue can be stressed.

Knowing the temperament of the community, the producer will try to develop a program, then, along lines of local interest. He will adjust his message to the tastes of the people, never entering into political controversy, but using every opportunity to make his message about Christ and the Church a living reality in the

community's mind. He will also be guided about the use of music from what he finds out about community tastes in this respect. In a community that is predominantly disposed to hillbilly bands, he won't all of a sudden do a program with nothing but recordings of the Chant. If he has at his disposal a good choir, this can be used from time to time. If not, he must depend upon recorded music.

In order to make an effective use of the time at his disposal, then, he must find out just what talent he has at hand, how best he can use it, and then arrange a schedule of programs—what subjects he is going to treat, and when, what talent he will use, what recordings he needs; who, if anybody, will be on the program with him, or if there are several priests in the community, which ones will be invited to speak and on what days. (For a discussion of types of programs, see my brochure *The Production of Religious Radio Programs,* a copy of which may be obtained free by writing to the National Council of Catholic Men, 1312 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W., Washington, D. C.)

Publicity

We have pointed out that no matter how good a program a person may produce, it is ineffective if nobody listens to it. So the task of publicizing his program falls on the shoulders of the priest director.

First of all, the program can certainly be announced in the local diocesan paper. Good contacts with the editors of the local secular papers are also helpful. If they get advance notice of the programs, brief biographies of the program participants, human interest stories on the program, they will usually give some space to it.

Penny postal cards to people, Catholic and non-Catholic alike, in the community, also help to publicize the show. These cards can be mimeographed on the church's mimeograph machine, as a project of the Sodality, or perhaps some local Catholic has a business where he uses mimeographing. He could perhaps be enlisted to prepare the cards.

Then, of course, the listeners should be invited to write in. They should be encouraged to give their reactions to the show, indicate what subjects they would like to hear treated on the program, what kind of music they would like to hear more of, and so on.

Follow-ups

Let us suppose that some non-Catholic listeners write in and indicate an interest in knowing more about the Church. The priest director should have on supply some literature to send them as a follow-up. One of the best books of this kind is, *The Question Box* by Father Conway, C.S.P. The advantage of a book of this kind is that, while the inquirer may indicate interest in only one question— the Virgin Birth, for instance— still if he has a book like this he will sooner or later read it and find out more and more about the Church. There are numerous pamphlets on specific subjects of Catholic teaching that could also be used for this purpose. In some cases, the local program can offer to send copies of the talk or the other program features to listeners. Offers like this also stimulate audience response.

If an inquirer gives evidence of definite interest in becoming a Catholic, then, of course, the radio priest should be ready and willing to interview him and give him instructions.

Finances

Most local Catholic programs that I know of are run on a shoestring. It is usually necessary to enlist the aid of volunteer workers to handle publicity, mailing, and so on. So the budget for a local show need not be too high, but there has to be one. Depending upon the demand, it will be necessary to purchase pamphlets or books like *The Question Box*. This should not run into any large figure.

But like all operations, a radio program, even with lots of volunteer help, runs into money. One must have a certain amount of stationery; one must have some income. This can usually be obtained by asking the Catholic listeners to contribute to the program. This cannot be done over the air if the station gives the program time free. But there is no reason why the Catholics of the community should not be asked by letters to help out. Of course, there is no reason why, from time to time, there should not be church socials, and other forms of money-raising activities for the support of the radio program.

Under no circumstances should non-Catholics be asked to contribute to the program, nor should they be charged for any literature they receive. However, I see no reason why a well-disposed non-

Catholic who would want to make a contribution should have his offer rejected.

Program Direction

The priest in the community who has charge of the program should be the contact with the station and it should be his personal responsibility to see that the programs are lined up well ahead of broadcast date, that all talent is on hand for the show, and that all scripts are properly cleared with the diocesan authorities or their delegates, that all the necessary music, whether recorded or live, is arranged for. He should also be responsible for seeing to it that all scripts are in accord with station policy.

Once he has done all this, he should sit in on as many of the programs as possible, and if the studio prefers it, he should actually time the show, and cue it through its run in rehearsal and on the air. In some cases a studio program director takes over this task.

In fine, he should consider himself as the living link between the station and the Church in these radio matters. No station likes to deal with a multitude of people, all of whom have fingers in the radio pie. It prefers to deal with one person or one organization that will assume all the details of production and will guarantee that the programs are properly approved and in accord with station policy.

Music

One of the main ingredients of most radio programs is music. It is used to develop an emotional atmosphere on the dramatic program. It is used for the same purpose on even the ordinary talk program. But it has a still further use as an apologetical medium.

Most local stations and local program directors tell me they have great difficulty in getting music for their shows. In many cases live choirs are not available, or there are so few and their repertoires so limited that live music is almost impossible.

There are several ways out of this problem. The one is to use recorded music, and the other is to develop programs with local talented soloists—whether vocal or instrumental.

In the case of recorded music suitable for Catholic programs, here too, there is a great lack. Several firms produce recordings that can be used on local religious programs.

In addition, The Radio Corporation of America produces the

"RCA Thesaurus" which consists of musical selections of all types from hillbilly to opera, and recorded by various vocal and instrumental combinations. Sesac, Inc., also produces a similar transcribed service. In both these collections there are some recordings of typical Catholic music. Both these services are available to radio stations on a subscription basis, but no two radio stations in the same listening area are allowed to subscribe to the same service.

The radio producer, then, should inquire from his station manager whether or not the station subscribes to a transcription service of this kind, and if so, what kind of music is available for use on the Catholic program.

Branching Out

Inevitably, the priest radio director will find that his programs tend to grow and spread out. Sooner or later, from the priest's own radio work a nucleus of interested persons will come into being. Perhaps some will want to try their hand at writing scripts, or at production, or some other phase of radio work.

Perhaps, if there is a dramatic group in the neighborhood, that group will be available for radio work and dramatic script writing. But here again it must be noted that the "theatre" is not the radio. Again, the techniques are different, and they must be learned.

After some interest in radio is developed through the priest's activities, it may be time for him to think of setting up a radio workshop for the lay people of his area.

The purpose of such a workshop is to develop the talent of Catholics so that some of them at least may be put in the way of getting into professional radio. On all sides we hear that there is great need of Catholics in all the media of communication. There is need to combat the subversive influence of those groups and organizations that would try to destroy the American way of life and our notion of democracy by their subtle poisoning of the media of communication. Now if Catholics are to get into radio, one of the most important media, it is necessary that they be trained in the field. This training can be given in the local radio workshop.

Once a priest knows the general techniques of the field, and has made contacts with station executives and personnel, he will be able to invite some of these people to handle workshop sessions

where script-writing, radio speaking, production, and so on will be discussed and taught.

In a city where there are several parishes, it will be good to have people from all the parishes attend the workshop—that is, all who are interested. The basis for attendance is not that this is a St. John's Parish affair, but a meeting for all who are interested in working in radio.

The accent should be on radio, not on which parish can produce the best program. If this latter attitude is taken, the programs will have a certain spotty character about them, and the good of the over-all movement will be lost in fruitless rivalry. In radio you learn to get along together—everybody working for the show, no matter who he is, or where he comes from. So, the radio workshop should be operated on a city-wide, rather than a parish-wide basis.

Recordings

Many times the priest who operates a religious program finds himself running out of scripts or other material to carry on his program. Or, in some cases, he finds that he has offers of so much time that he cannot fill all of his obligations in this regard. It may be that then he will have to fall back on recorded programs, or carry one of the nationally transcribed programs.

The Local Program and Network Programs

A further word should be said about the relationship between the priest radio director and the national network religious programs.

In the case of the National Broadcasting Company, the American Broadcasting Company, and the Mutual Broadcasting System, the Catholic programs are produced in co-operation with the National Council of Catholic Men. The Columbia Broadcasting System produces its own religious programs each week, and the Catholic Faith is represented on Columbia's Church of the Air on alternate Sundays for a half hour.

In any event, these programs represent the Church on a national basis. In some cases, however, a station manager will excuse himself from carrying them (and no station manager has to carry them), because he will say that he gives a half hour a week to the local Catholic priest for a program. Or, in some cases, he will not be willing to give time to a local priest for a program because he

says he is carrying, as a network affiliate, one of the network programs.

Both these excuses should be examined very carefully by the local priest radio director. The real philosophy of the matter is this, I think. If a firm like Standard Brands puts on a national program with outstanding stars of radio, stage, and screen, it does it to advertise its products. But it does so because it knows the local dealer will have on his shelves enough of those products to sell to the local customers. In somewhat the same way, the national religious radio program is the Church on the air nationally, reaching many millions of listeners, and making the first contacts with many of them who might otherwise never bother about the Church. But the local program, so to say, follows up that message on its own level, just as does the local dealer for a nationally advertised product. Thus, both the national and the local programs are needed. The one supplements the other.

I think, then, it might be well for the local priest director of radio to consider this in his dealings with local station managers. If the station he is working with is a network affiliate, it is eligible to carry one of these programs mentioned. The station manager should be urged to carry it if he is not already doing so.

The object of the local program will be to bring home to the listeners a particularization or a localization of the message heard on the national show. It works in commercial radio. I see no reason why it should not work on sustaining religious radio. There is a need for both types of programs, and local radio directors should work to achieve that end.

CONCLUSION

After all that has been said, it will be evident that radio work is exacting, time-consuming, and if the programs are to be good, arduous.

Nothing is of more importance in our day than radio as a means of communication. Obviously everybody isn't going to become a radio man. But at least, in order to have a critical appraisal of the art when listening to programs just as an ordinary member of the audience, a course or two in radio and its techniques seems to be a part of a well-rounded education.

Moreover, since the priest in radio is an important part of religious broadcasting, and since he is always a public figure in every community, he will be called upon to talk over the air from time to time, whether he makes radio a prime interest in his life or whether he doesn't.

For the above reasons, I feel that there is a desperate need for more courses in radio in Catholic colleges and seminaries. It will be in these courses that the elements of script writing, delivery, and so on could be taught, so that priests could take their places in the radio field as successful speakers, writers, and producers and directors, and in turn guide many of the laity into the same field.

Always ready to assist priests in the radio field is the Radio Bureau of the National Council of Catholic Men—to discuss script problems, production problems, and whatever else is connected with radio programs. The services of the Council extend to the production of recordings for use on local programs, and an ever-widening set of services so far as scripts, talks, music, and continuity are concerned.

And now, in very definite conclusion, may I ask the readers to say a prayer for the writer of these articles. Radio is a strange and wonderful field. I have often said that it is a school of humility, and that is true; but like all schools of humility, its lessons are hard to learn. That is why I need your prayers.

WILLIAM C. SMITH

The National Council of Catholic Men
Washington, D. C.

DEVOTION TO OUR LORD AND TO HIS MOTHER

It is a common sentiment of our nature to honor every good mother for the sake of her son: it is, then, against our regenerate nature to refuse honor to that best Mother of the best Son. And so it comes that His ministers are her ministers; that fidelity to the gospel of Christ is fidelity to devotion for Mary.

—Fr. Xavier Donald Macleod, in *Devotion to the Blessed Virgin Mary in North America* (New York, 1866), p. 11.

THE CHURCH AND CATHOLIC DOGMA

Two recent and well-written articles have focused the attention of American priests upon the widespread current interest in that part of sacred theology which deals with the development of dogma. The articles, the report on "Current Theology" produced by Dr. Philip Donnelly, S.J. for *Theological Studies* in 1947[1] and "Opinions Concerning Doctrinal Development," written by Dr. Charles E. Sheedy, C.S.C., and published in last month's issue of *The American Ecclesiastical Review*,[2] cast valuable light upon some of the more influential opinions now under discussion in European, and particularly in French, theological circles. Both writings were highly commendable. Together they will inevitably aid in bringing about a more intense study of the nature and the characteristics of Catholic dogma among the priests in our own country.

Any study in this field is valuable only to the extent that it is objective, explaining the function of the Church in presenting new dogmatic formulae and statements, rather than attempting to explain that function away. In carrying out its universal and unique commission to teach divine public revelation, the Church must obviously avail itself, from time to time, of a terminology or mode of expression which it has not previously employed. It would not be a living and effectively infallible teacher of God's message were it to act otherwise. The true study of doctrinal development considers this definite activity of Our Lord's true Church, and tries, ultimately, to describe and to explain it. Any theory about new dogmatic phraseology, on the other hand, which fails to take cognizance of the Church's work, or which attempts to explain the new formulae in terms of an imagined accretion of objective content in the body of dogma is definitely unscientific and runs counter to the Catholic faith.

In other words, the man who wishes to make an accurate study of the development of dogma must take cognizance of the fact that, as a doctrinal institution, the primary concern of the Catholic Church is to teach adequately and infallibly the divinely revealed message which it has received as such from the lips of the apostles. The

[1] Cf. *Theological Studies*, Sept. and Dec., 1947.

[2] Cf. pp. 19-32.

Church's power to teach infallibly on such matters as theological conclusions, dogmatic facts, the canonization of Saints, and the approval of religious orders stems from and centers around this primary objective of its teaching mission. The Church is empowered to pronounce inerrantly on these other subjects precisely and only because such activity must be included in the function of a living and effective infallible teacher of the revealed message itself. The Church, within which Our Lord lives and acts as the supreme Teacher of divine truth, must be able, not only to state this truth accurately and effectively to the men of all times and all places, but it must also be able unfailingly to recognize, in teaching presented under different cultural forms, both its own doctrine and tenets opposed to that doctrine.

In teaching the apostolic deposit of divine revelation infallibly over the course of the centuries, the Catholic Church has never denied in itself and has never excluded from this body of teaching any individual truth or group of truths received from the apostles as part of the body of God's message. Furthermore, the Church has never proposed as a part of that message any assertions which were not really contained in the apostolic deposit. Finally, it has never misinterpreted either any individual truth contained in scripture or tradition or the body of divine public revelation as a whole. And, on the positive side, the Church has actually taught, at every time since its inception, the entire deposit of God's teaching entrusted to its care.

Now the body of Catholic dogma is that deposit of truth which the Church finds in Sacred Scripture and in divine apostolic tradition, and which, by its solemn judgment or in its ordinary and universal teaching activity, it presents as having been revealed by God to be believed by all men with the assent of divine faith. Since the Catholic Church has been divinely commissioned and empowered to teach God's revealed message infallibly and *adequately* to all men, it is evident that, at any time during the course of the Church's long history, the body of Catholic dogma has always been and will ever be objectively identical with the original deposit of revelation as the Church originally received it from the lips of the apostles themselves. What the Church sets forth as God's revealed teaching is always exactly and substantially what the apostles told the Church to hold and teach as the divine message.

Just as obviously, however, the form and the language in which that teaching is expressed has developed over the course of the centuries. The doctrine the Church teaches is exactly the same as the doctrine the apostles gave the Church, but a great many of the words and the forms in which the Church asserts this body of truth are and manifestly must be quite distinct from those employed by the apostles themselves. The Church would not be an adequate and effective infallible teaching agency otherwise. Teaching necessarily involves a process of setting forth a body of truth in the language and in terms of the mentality of those who are to learn this truth. It implies labor in the direction of clarity and accuracy. It demands effort to prevent ambiguity and misunderstanding, and to answer the questions which occur to particular sets of learners. Unless the teacher of any body of doctrine is able to answer queries about the content of his message, his efforts are valueless.

The Catholic Church has fulfilled all of these requirements for successful teaching. And, in thus presenting divine public revelation to men, the Church has necessarily and continually made use of new dogmatic formulae and new doctrinal definitions. The new dogmatic formulae are, in the last analysis, merely ways in which the Church has presented to new ages and new cultures the same set of truths which it had previously taught in an older phraseology to other men. The new definitions are the final and thus completely satisfactory resolutions of questions which more recent generations have asked about the meaning and the content of the Church's divine message. Both procedures have been and, until the end of time will ever be, absolutely requisite for the Church in pursuance of its doctrinal commission. Neither adds any shred or aspect of doctrine to the original apostolic deposit entrusted to the Church from the beginning. Yet both can and should be reckoned as constituting an advance in the teaching of this same divine message.

Thus the new dogmatic formula in which the first oecumenical council declared that the Son of God is consubstantial (ὁμοούσιος) with the Father prevented any excuse for an erroneous teaching on this point based on an ambiguity on the part of the orthodox presentation. The definition of the Roman Pontiff's infallibility by the most recent oecumenical council answered, once and for all, a question about the content of divine revelation. In both instances

the Catholic Church asserted truths which had always been a part of its own doctrinal heritage. Moreover, in both cases, the Church advanced the cause of truth.

It has been the fashion among some recent writers to explain the dogmatic development within the Catholic Church in terms of certain analogies. Some have likened it to the process by which an oak tree develops out of an acorn. Others have attempted to clarify the issue by comparing it to the process in which white light is broken up into the various colors of the spectrum when it is passed through a prism. Lately an attempt has been made to explain it by a comparison with the process through which a formless mass of precious metal is minted into small coins.

The first comparison is definitely misleading. An oak tree contains an abundance of material not included in the acorn, while the dogma of the Catholic Church contains all and only the divine public revelation which was communicated to the Church prior to the death of the last apostle. The second comparison is innocuous enough, although it has only a very limited effectiveness in elucidating the development of dogma. The third comparison is harmful, implying a fundamental misunderstanding about the nature of the original revealed deposit entrusted to the Church.

The only completely acceptable and valuable approach to an explanation of the development of Catholic dogma is to be found, however, not in an appeal to some completely extrinsic factor, but in terms of the teaching process itself. There are new dogmatic formulae and new dogmatic definitions, and these are exact statements of the original apostolic deposit of revealed divine truth because and only because the Church is a living and infallible society within which Our Lord resides and acts as the Supreme Teacher. Primarily the dogmatic message as it stands is to be compared with the original deposit as received from the lips of the apostles, not as a tree is compared with its seed, but as a message accurately and adequately taught by a living teaching agency is to be compared with that message as it was originally imparted to the teacher.

In the light of this basic truth about the nature of Catholic dogma, certain tendencies in recent theorizing about this subject must be evaluated. These tendencies seem to stem from a desire on the part of some Catholic writers to assert the vitally effective truths of

our faith in a medium more acceptable to modern minds than that of scholasticism. Unfortunately, however, they all-too-frequently lead towards a misconception of Catholic doctrine as such.

In the first place there is an observable modern tendency to understress or even to deny the fact that the original deposit of revealed truth communicated to the Church by the apostles was and is a body of intellectual teaching. We are sometimes solicited to imagine that the original revealed deposit did not consist in a set of explicitly revealed propositions at all, but rather in the Godhead or in the Person of Christ. In other words, we are told to believe that what the apostles delivered to the Church at the beginning was a thing which could be described, rather than a definite teaching about that reality.

This tendency can lead to a serious misunderstanding of the Catholic message itself. Like any other specious and therefore formidable miscalculation, it is based upon a manifest truth, a truth it twists into a false meaning. It is a fact that the object of divine Catholic faith is in one sense God Himself, the divine Reality. But, at the same time, this object is definitely and truly a series of intellectual propositions or judgments. There is no shadow of opposition between these two truths. From the time of St. Thomas Aquinas an explicit statement of these two aspects of divine Catholic faith has been part of the traditional heritage of scholastic theology.

It is an integral part of Catholic truth that the original apostolic deposit of revelation given to the true Church of Jesus Christ consisted both in the Person of Our Lord and in a body of intellectual teaching, a series of judgments expressed in statements or propositions. The vision of the Divine Persons in a manner independent of and superior to the human process of knowledge by means of ideas and judgments belongs to the status of the Church triumphant rather than to that of the Church militant. If the deposit of revelation given to the Church by the apostles had consisted in Our Lord Himself to the exclusion of a body of teaching, then obviously the subsequent dogmatic statements of the Church would be merely expressions of its experience of Christ.

On the other hand, it is quite incorrect to infer or to imply that the traditional Catholic theologians as a class, or, for that matter, any real Catholic theologian whatsoever, could be judged guilty of teaching that the original deposit of apostolic revelation consisted

in a body of propositions with no reference to God or to His Christ. The truth is that the apostles handed over to the Church a definite body of teaching about God. This body of teaching about God is, in this world, the only basic means by which men may acquire an awareness of the supernatural truth about God in this world. It is the one body of teaching which, by the help of God's grace, men have accepted with the firm and supernatural assent of divine Catholic faith.

Another aspect of this same highly objectionable tendency in modern writing manifests itself in a denial of the fact that the implicit content of the original deposit of revelation can be ascertained by way of theological reasoning. Not infrequently in these times we encounter a hint or a statement to the effect that the choice of new dogmatic formulae and the content of new dogmatic definitions has resulted from some sort of religious instinct within the Church, or even from the indwelling of the Holy Ghost within this society, to the exclusion of any properly logical evidence that the more recent propositions have been really though implicitly contained in the original apostolic deposit from the very beginning. The men who follow this trend are not slow to stigmatize the methods of their opponents as "theologistic" or "intellectualistic."

The truth of the matter is, however, that the Church does not make dogmatic pronouncements apart from logically satisfactory evidence that the truth it asserts as divinely revealed actually forms a part of that body of revealed teaching which it received from the apostles and which it is commissioned and empowered infallibly to teach until the end of time. It remains perfectly true that the evidence upon which the Church acts may well be something which has escaped the notice of a good number of its own theologians, and even of the best among its theologians. Such a case occurred when the dogma of Our Lady's Immaculate Conception was defined by Pope Pius IX. Nevertheless, the evidence was in existence and was examined by the Holy Father before he issued his definition.

When he began his preparation for the definition of the Immaculate Conception, Pope Pius IX made it completely clear that he relied upon the assistance of divine grace to enlighten his mind on the project he was about to undertake. In an encyclical letter dated Feb. 2, 1849, the great pontiff begged the bishops of the

Catholic world to have the faithful entrusted to their care pray publicly for him.[3] Yet Pope Pius IX certainly did not consider that this divine help in any way exempted him from examining the properly theological evidence about this doctrine. In this same encyclical he announced the appointment of a pontifical commission to study this evidence and to report to him.

The commission appointed at that time by Pope Pius IX applied itself first of all to a consideration of the characteristics in function of which a truth or a proposition is said to be definable as Catholic dogma. It indicated no less than nine principles which must be employed in evaluating a proposition as definable.[4] The first four among these principles dealt with the type of evidence not absolutely necessary in order that a proposition should properly be judged as definable.

(1) The fact that, in the past, there have been conflicting teachings on this subject within the Catholic Church, or the fact that all have not hitherto agreed on this teaching, does not render a doctrine incapable of definition.

(2) The fact that even authoritative writers can be quoted in opposition to a teaching does not render that teaching incapable of being defined.

(3) In order that a doctrine be definable, it is not necessary that there should be explicit, or even implicit, testimony to this doctrine in Sacred Scripture, since it is certain and manifest that the scope of revelation is wider than that of Scripture.

(4) In order to show that the doctrine to be defined belongs to Tradition, it is not necessary to adduce a series of Fathers and of other witnesses reaching back to apostolic times.

All of these negative principles imply the commission's conviction that, in order that a doctrine should be considered as definable, there must be real evidence that this teaching is actually to be found in the apostolic deposit of divine public revelation. The commission

[3] Cf. Cardinal Gousset, *La croyance générale et constante de l'église touchant l'Immaculée Conception de la Bienheureuse Vièrge Marie* (Paris, 1855), pp. 22 ff.

[4] For a more complete examination of this report, see the article "The Requisites for an Infallible Pontifical Definition according to the Commission of Pope Pius IX," in *The American Ecclesiastical Review*, CXV, 5 (Nov. 1946), 376 ff.

manifested not the slightest trace of willingness to content itself with a conviction about the definability of a doctrine based upon some corporate religious sense within the Church or upon any other so-called "non-intellectual" factor. This concern of the commission shows itself even more clearly in the positive principles it delineated.

(1) In order that a statement may be considered as definable, there must be a certain number of solemn testimonies directly pertinent to it.

(2) A proposition is capable of being defined if there can be found one or more revealed principles containing it.

(3) A proposition is capable of being defined if it shows a necessary connection with dogmas. In other words, a proposition ought to be accepted as revealed when, from the denial of this proposition, there follows by logical and immediate necessity the denial of one or more revealed principles.

(4) A proposition may be defined as Catholic dogma if it is preached as a part of divine public revelation in the concordant teaching of the actual episcopate.

(5) A proposition is capable of definition when it is shown to be a part of divine public revelation by the practice of the Church.

In calling for a theological examination of the question he considered defining and for a study of the conditions that rendered a truth capable of definition, Pope Pius IX stated clearly that he was following the precedent established by his predecessors on the pontifical throne. It was clearly his idea that it would be impossible to define a doctrine as a Catholic dogma of faith in the absence of definite theological evidence that this doctrine was contained in the original apostolic deposit of divine public revelation. The report of his commission manifests this same certainty. Clearly the report of the commission is not in any sense an infallible document of the Catholic Church. It is, nevertheless, an authentic and highly important statement, especially in the light of its intimate connection with the ultimate definition of Our Lady's Immaculate Conception. It indicated the sort of procedure the Church actually employed. This procedure turns out to be something tremendously remote from the kind of thing conjured up by those writers who have protested against "theologism" in the accurate and traditional descriptions of definable doctrinal propositions.

According to what the commission found to be the norms

actually used by the Church in discerning propositions which are capable of being defined as dogmas, the *ecclesia docens* has always looked to see that there was solid theological evidence that a doctrine was contained in the original deposit of revelation before defining it. Once this doctrine has been proposed as a dogma of the Church by the Holy Father himself or by the *ecclesia docens* under his leadership, it is something to be accepted as true on the authority of God revealing it, rather than by reason of the theological demonstration which showed it to be a part of the original apostolic deposit. Nevertheless, prior to the definition itself, it was the manifest duty of the Church authorities to investigate the theological evidence pertinent to the doctrine to be defined. The charism of infallibility, protecting the Holy Father and the *ecclesia docens* as a whole from misinterpreting the divine message, in no way dispensed the divinely authorized teachers within the Church from this investigation of theological evidence. This could not be true unless there is actually available sufficient theological evidence in favor of every truth defined as dogma by the Catholic Church throughout the course of the centuries.

Incidentally, the report of the commission appointed by Pope Pius IX gives little support to those writers who would draw a real distinction between formal implicit revelation and virtual revelation. These writers are under the impression that a doctrine is formally but implicitly revealed when it is really contained in the original deposit of divine revelation, although not thus contained in the phraseology or the manner in which it has subsequently been presented by the Church. A thing is said to be virtually revealed when it can be shown to belong to the revealed message by means of a genuine demonstration based on principles contained in the revealed message itself. The writers who hold that there is a real distinction between these two concepts hold that the virtually revealed proposition is arrived at by means of a true process of reasoning, a passage from one truth to another, while the process by which one establishes the authenticity of a statement formally and implicitly revealed is not a genuine reasoning process at all, since there is no real passage from one truth to another.

The commission gave no sanction to such a distinction. A truth was considered as definable when one or more revealed principles containing it can be found or when, from a denial of the proposition

under consideration, there followed with logical necessity the denial of one or more revealed principles. From this point of view at least, the commission found nothing to prevent the definition as a Catholic dogma of any proposition which assumes the stature of a genuine theological conclusion.

This traditional and genuine concept of doctrinal development in the Catholic Church is far from denying a real distinction between faith and theology. The point of the matter is, however, that the real distinction between these two entities is not based on the order of reality with which they deal, but rather upon the manner in which they deal with it. Divine Catholic faith is the acceptance of Catholic dogma, an absolutely certain assent based upon the authority of God revealing. The Church which proposes and formulates the dogmatic message acts as the instrument of Our Lord, residing within it and governing its doctrinal activity. The individual theologian acts as the servant of the Church in explaining and teaching this same message, expounding the doctrines and showing how they are contained in the original revealed deposit.

Theology presents its message in the form of conclusions, of propositions set forth as acceptable by reason of their demonstration from principles of divine faith. In point of fact, most of the conclusions presented in the average manual of theology and demonstrated and explained in the light of their position in the original deposit of faith are actually dogmas of the Church. It is precisely the demonstrative and discursive presentation of these truths which is proper to theology as such. Dogma differs from theology, not because it deals with a different realm or variety of truth, but because it is a body of truth authoritatively presented by the apostolic college and by the head of that college, acting as the instruments of Christ within the Church, presented in such a way that its acceptability does not depend upon the value of any demonstration but only upon God's own authority.

Another tendency manifest in some recent writings on Catholic dogma is that which classifies the original deposit of faith with other great ideas, which have developed and have vitally affected mankind. Thus we are led to believe that there is a similarity between the development of the ideas of democracy, of nationalism, and of communism and the development of Catholic dogma within the true Church of Jesus Christ. However respectable the original

source of this theory may be, the doctrine itself is quite incompatible with the truth about Christian revelation.

The "ideas" to which the authors who favor this tendency allude were concepts which at first designated certain vague and formless things that proved eminently desirable to great portions of the human family. A great many individuals attempted to clarify these originally vague concepts and, in the course of time, a number of explanations were forthcoming. Some of these explanations turned out to be inconsistent with the original notions. Others proved to be acceptable expressions of these much-discussed concepts. In every case, however, the men who were attracted by certain originally vague ideals were solely occupied with the task of explaining to themselves and to others the details which belonged to the objects they desired.

The Christian message, however, was never a vague or formless concept at all. It was not at first nor at any time merely the object of an inchoate and wordless desire on the part of human beings. It was a definite teaching from God, presented as such by Our Lord, and shown to be authentic through the various motives of credibility He attached to it. Its development is merely the continued process of teaching this same doctrine by Our Lord through the Church within which He resides.

Thus it is not true that Catholic dogma is in any way different from the original deposit of faith or from the body of Catholic teaching at any time during the history of the Church. It is true, of course, that much of Catholic dogma finds no expression in the earliest monuments of Christian literature. One who knows the status of primitive Christian literature would never make the mistake of imagining that it contains all that was taught as divinely revealed during the earliest years of the Church. It is also true that a certain amount of Catholic dogma is not contained in the inspired books of Sacred Scripture. The Scripture is not the only source of divine revelation.

What the Church teaches today as Catholic dogma does not differ in the least substantially and objectively from what the Church taught as dogma during the first centuries or from what the Church received as divine revelation from the lips of the original members of the apostolic college. Although, from time to time during the

course of the centuries, the Church has made use of new formulae in teaching its dogmas, no one of these new formulae has ever opposed or contradicted any dogma of the Church or any other formula in which the *ecclesia docens* had authoritatively expressed its divinely revealed message previously. Once the infallible teaching Church has consecrated a formula as an accurate statement of a divinely revealed truth, that formula can never be relinquished. It always remains the infallibly correct expression of a truth contained in the deposit of Christian revelation. In every case, new dogmatic formulae serve to set forth explicitly truths already forming a part of God's revealed message, truths already presented, really though implicitly, under previously existing dogmatic formulae. In no case can the new formula be understood as a correction or replacement of the old.

Finally, it is quite misleading to imagine that Catholic dogma today can accurately be described as something which the early Christians could not and did not foresee. They were perfectly aware of that message which is now expressed and enshrined in Catholic dogma. They could not, of course, be expected to have previous knowledge of the cultural and linguistic reasons which made imperative the present mode of teaching the very truths which they believed and which we believe. They could not foresee the Tridentine expression of God's revelation about His grace, but the teaching they believed was and is the very doctrine which Trent infallibly expounded.

JOSEPH CLIFFORD FENTON

The Catholic University of America,
Washington, D. C.

MISSION INTENTION

"The Church in the Belgian Congo" is the Holy Father's Mission Intention for the month of February, 1949.

Answers to Questions

ON THE REVIVAL OF VESPERS

Question: What is the obligation of a pastor to have Vespers on Sunday afternoon or evening in accordance with the recent letter *Mediator Dei* and the old prescription of the Baltimore Council? As we have the *Kyriale* for the congregational singing of High Mass, what do we have for the singing of Vespers?

Answer: Vespers, in a more or less truncated form, used to be the regular Sunday service for the afternoon and evening in our churches but for several decades the practice has fallen into desuetude. In the *Mediator Dei* of our Holy Father there is an earnest recommendation that the pious custom of holding the Vesper service for the laity be not allowed to become obsolete but the encyclical states that, in this matter, nothing is prescribed as of strict law. "It is very earnestly to be hoped that lay folk should take active part in reciting or singing the office of Vespers on feast days in their own parishes."

The Second Plenary Council of Baltimore (Tit. VI, Cap. iii, 379) did order that Vespers be sung, and in their entirety, in all churches on Sundays and feast days and that Vespers be not omitted on account of other services. However, the Fathers of the Council inserted the clause, "quatenus fieri potest," in consideration of practical difficulties in the carrying out of the decree. The Council furthermore (*loc. cit.* 380) recommended that the rudiments of Gregorian chant be taught in the parish schools to the end that eventually a great part of the congregation would be able to chant Vespers with the clergy. The Third Plenary Council (Tit. III, Cap. iv, 118) legislated that Vespers must be sung in their entirety, with no abbreviation of the psalms, and quoted (*loc. cit.* 119) the words of the Second Council concerning the teaching of chant in the schools.

As to the obligation of initiating or restoring Vespers as the regular Sunday afternoon or evening service in parish churches, while the *Mediator Dei* of the Holy Father certainly recommends Vespers in preference to any non-liturgical devotion, nothing is

prescribed as of strict law. The words of the Second Plenary Council are more forceful, "volumus et mandamus," but they are modified by the added expression, "quatenus fieri potest." It would be most desirable to have Vespers as the regular Sunday devotion especially if they were chanted by the congregation along with the clergy *in choro,* which was the end in view of the Second Plenary Council when it recommended the training of school children in Gregorian chant. It should be noted that when Vespers are sung, both the Pope and the Baltimore Council understand the canonical hour of Vespers, with psalms and other portions complete, not the sacred concert which used to masquerade under the name of Vespers in the days of our youth. In this connection, it should be noted that, outside of places with obligation of choir, when there is difficulty in singing the Vespers proper to the day, with all the variations prescribed by the rubrics, it is quite proper to sing Vespers of the Blessed Sacrament or of Our Lady, which remain almost constant in text throughout the year (S. R. C. [Dec. 29, 1884], no. 3624 *ad* 12).

The Sunday office of Compline, because of the few changes *de tempore* involved in its recitation, would make an excellent Sunday devotion, liturgically correct and quite easy to manage. While rarely met with in this country, Compline is frequently sung as a Sunday service in England and Ireland.

For the singing of Vespers, the equivalent of the *Kyriale* of the Mass is the *Vesperale.*

PRECEDENCE OF PRELATES

Question: During the diocesan retreat we noticed that "A," who was ordained in 1917 and made a domestic prelate in 1940, took precedence over "B," who was ordained in 1920 and made a domestic prelate in 1936. Was this correct? Do diocesan consultors who are prelates take precedence over other prelates of the same grade? If the chancellor of the diocese is a prelate, where does he fit in the procession?

Answer: The precedence of prelates of the same rank, according to the *Annuario pontificio,* is determined by the date of their designation as prelates. So, *in casu,* "B" should take precedence over "A," despite the prior ordination of "A," since "B" was made a domestic prelate four years before "A."

As to the precedence of diocesan consultors, when they are also prelates, since there is nothing in the common law of the Church which regulates their rank, except that in a wide sense they are the equivalent of the cathedral chapter (Cf. *Codex juris,* canon 423), their precedence with reference to the diocesan clergy generally as well as to other priests of the diocese who are prelates, would be a matter to be settled by the Ordinary (cf. canon 106, 6°). The same is to be said of the precedence of the chancellor, who in this country is a personage of far greater importance than that of the simple notary, by which name he is known *in juri communi* (cf. canon 372, § 3). In the United States, the chancellor is the executive secretary of the diocese, with duties similar to those of a vicar-general *in spiritualibus,* and hence he is given high rank, both by custom and by episcopal designation, in the order of precedence among the priests of the diocese.

THE *CREDO* ON ST. PATRICK'S DAY

Question: I noticed that the *Credo* was sung at a Solemn Mass on the feast of St. Patrick in a church whose titular was not St. Patrick nor was that saint the patron of the diocese or the district. While I yield to none in my devotion to the great Apostle of Ireland, no *Credo* is marked in the Ordo for that day and what becomes of the old *DAP creditur, MUC non creditur* of our seminary days?

Answer: The old mnemonic of MUC and DAP, with reference to the days on which the *Credo* is to be said, is still valid. Regularly, therefore, the feast of St. Patrick, being one of a Confessor falling in the MUC class, has no *Credo.* The Creed is added to the Mass when the feast is that of the titular of the church or the patron of the diocese or the country. If, however, there is great devotion to St. Patrick in a district, one Mass of the saint may be sung in any church with the *Credo* inserted *ratione solemnitatis.* A large concourse of the faithful must attend this Mass to warrant for it the privilege of the *Credo,* as well as certain other distinctions. Naturally, what is said of the Mass of St. Patrick applies to other popular feasts which are celebrated with great solemnity in any locality (cf. *Addit. et Var. in Rub. Missalis,* VII, 3, and IV, 1-3).

WILLIAM J. LALLOU

PHOTOGRAPHY IN CHURCH

Question 1: Should a photographer be allowed to take pictures of the ceremonies in our churches, particularly during the celebration of Mass?

Question 2: Is it fitting to photograph a graduating class seated in the sanctuary?

Answer 1: It seems to be an accepted custom nowadays to allow photographers to take pictures whenever they wish in the course of the ceremonies conducted in Catholic churches—often with the distracting feature of blinding flashlights. Doubtless such pictures have a certain religious value, in that they bring to the attention of those who see them the dignity and the beauty of Catholic ceremonies. Hence, they should not be entirely forbidden. But, on the other hand, photographers should not be permitted to take pictures in such wise as to distract both the priests and the people, and to give the impression that our sacred ceremonies are intended merely as a gorgeous pageant. It is strongly recommended that photographers be forbidden to take pictures of the Blessed Sacrament exposed, as at the elevation of the Mass and Benediction. A writer in *The Irish Ecclesiastical Record* for October, 1948 (p. 948) makes this practical comment: "We suggest that pictures should never be taken of the Sacred Host. The liturgical laws which prescribe that the tabernacle and sacred vessels must be veiled when they contain the Blessed Sacrament and those which forbid Exposition without explicit permission of the local Ordinary surely express the mind of the Church on this point."

Answer 2: Doubtless the intention of a priest who has his graduates photographed in the sanctuary is a commendable one—to provide the boys and girls with a picture which in future years will serve to remind them of the religious aspects of their education. From this standpoint the custom in question could be defended. However, generally speaking, it would seem better to have the picture made in more secular surroundings.

LOW MASSES IN PLACE OF HIGH MASSES

Question: What should a religious priest do if his superior

commands him habitually to celebrate Low Masses for stipends which he knows were given and accepted for High Masses?

Answer: It is very evident that a priest does not satisfy his obligation if he accepts a stipend with the understanding that he will offer a High Mass for the intention of the donor, and yet celebrates a Low Mass. Hence, a religious commanded to say a Low Mass for a person who gave the larger stipend stipulated for a High Mass should tell his superior that he is aware that he is not adequately fulfilling the contract involved, and ask the superior to arrange for the celebration of a High Mass. If the superior persists in commanding him to celebrate the Low Mass for the donor, he should obey, though he should refer the matter to a higher superior, at least when a considerable number of Masses is at stake. The religious should offer the Low Mass for the intention of the donor, so that the ministerial fruits of the Holy Sacrifice would be applied according to the latter's wish. But the obligation to apply the external solemnity of a High Mass to the donor would still remain. In a religious community the obligation would rest on the conscience of the superior. In order to fulfil this obligation it would not be necessary to apply the *fruits* of a High Mass to the intentions of the donor. It would suffice to celebrate a High Mass in which the fruits would be applied for a person who gave a stipend for a Low Mass, while the spiritual benefits of the external solemnity are directed to the intentions of the first donor (cf. Cappello, *De sacramentis* [Rome, 1938], I, n. 690).

Is the obligation of applying the external solemnity of another Mass grave or light? It would seem that when there is question of a single Mass the obligation would usually be light, since the difference between the stipend for a Low Mass and that for a High Mass is generally not grave matter, and the substantial object of the contract, the fruits of the Mass, has been conferred on the donor (cf. Loiano, *Institutiones theologiae moralis* [Turin, 1940], I, n. 191). But if several Low Masses were substituted in the manner described for High Masses, so that the portion of the stipends unjustly retained would reach the sum required for a grave sin of theft, a mortal sin would be committed, and there

would be a grave obligation to make restitution by the application of the external solemnity of a corresponding number of High Masses. It should be remembered that the ceremonial additions of a High Mass possess great spiritual value because of the impetration of the Church.

FRANCIS J. CONNELL, C.SS.R.

FIFTY YEARS AGO

In *The American Ecclesiastical Review* for February, 1899, the leading article, by Fr. F. P. Siegfried, is a lengthy review of three recent books, one in English and two in French, on the writings of Pascal. While admitting that the brilliant Frenchman seems to have been inclined to scepticism and Jansenism, Fr. Siegfried contends that we can profit by the apologetic method of Pascal, which he thus synthesizes: "He goes straight to Jesus Christ, the centre of the present order of facts, of all human history. . . . In Pascal's mind the proof of Our Lord's divinity carries with it evidently and by right the certainty of the Creator's existence, the immortality of the human soul, and the truths of natural religion and ethics". . . . Beginning a series of articles on "Church Building," Abbé Hogan discusses the general preparations for the erection of a sacred edifice, such as the selection of the site, the choice of an architect, etc. He condemns undue haste in the work of building, and suggests that the ornamental completion of the structure be deferred until what has to be done can be done well. . . . An anonymous writer contributes an article entitled "Twenty Clerical Don'ts." Among them are: "Don't leave the tabernacle key on the altar after your Mass. . . . Don't defer going on a sick-call for hours after receiving the notice. . . . Don't slam the sacristy, church or house door". . . . Fr. A. McDonald defends the opinion that the actual date of Our Lord's birth was December 25. . . . A favorable review is given to the work *Hard Sayings,* by Fr. George Tyrell, S.J. [who later became one of the most prominent leaders in the Modernistic movement].

F.J.C.

Analecta

From the first day of January, 1949, children of non-Catholics when baptized Catholics will be bound to observe the formalities required by the Code for the celebration of marriage, even if they have been reared from infancy outside the Catholic Church. This is a prospective provision and does not affect the validity of marriage contracted prior to 1949. Its effect follows the abrogation, by a *motu proprio* dated Aug. 1, 1948,[1] of the clause of canon 1099 which in the following transcription is placed in italics:

. . . acatholici sive baptizati sive non baptizati, si inter se contrahant, nullibi tenentur ad catholicam matrimonii formam servandam; *item ab acatholicis nati, etsi in Ecclesia catholica baptizati, qui ab infantili aetate in haeresi vel schismate aut infidelitate vel sine ulla religione adoleverunt, quoties cum parte acatholica contraxerint.*

The obligation imposed on members of Oriental rites by canon 1099, § 1, 3°, to observe the formalities required by canon 1094 in the case in which an Oriental contracts marriage with a member of the Latin rite does not conflict with the provision of canon 1097, § 2, requiring that marriage be contracted in the rite of the man and in the presence of the latter's pastor. Therefore, the Code Commission has declared, the obligation remains fully effective.[2]

On the same day on which this interpretation was issued, July 8, 1948, the Code Commission also published an interpretation of canon 1052.[3] It declared that through the provision of that canon not only the impediment expressly mentioned in the petition is removed by the dispensation granted in response to it but also any other impediment of the same kind in the same degree or in a more remote degree.

The Sacrament of Confirmation may be administered by priests of the Latin rite to members of Oriental rites committed to their charge in the same cases in which they may administer it to their charges who are members of the Latin rite. This concession was made by a decree of the Sacred Congregation for the Oriental Church dated May 1, 1948.[4] It reminds the minister that he must

[1] *Acta Apostolicae Sedis*, XL (1948), 305.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 386.
[3] *Ibid.*, p. 386.
[4] *Ibid.*, p. 422.

ascertain that the member of the Oriental rite was not confirmed, as is customary, immediately after the administration of the Sacrament of Baptism.

The Sacred Congregation of Rites declared on June 10, 1948,[5] that in a translation of the Good Friday services it is permitted to refer to the Jews in a sense indicating their infidelity rather than in one that would be more offensive because of its too literal adherence to the Latin *"perfidi Iudaei"* and *"Iudaica perfidia."*

A decree of the Sacred Congregation of Religious [6] modifies the decree *"Sancitum est"* published by the same Sacred Congregation on March 8, 1922,[7] regarding the quinquennial report required of religious institutes. Provision is made in the recent decree for secular institutes and for federations of religious houses belonging to religious institutes, quasi-religious societies, and secular institutes; the report of these federations is to be sent in each fifth year of the cycle commencing with Jan. 1, 1943 (the next report is due from them in 1952). This is the year also for the report of quasi-religious societies, as well as of secular institutes of pontifical approval. No change is made in the decree in regard to the years in which religious institutes of women enjoying pontifical approval shall send their report. In the case of the reports of religious institutes of men, however, all regulars who are not canon regular, monks or members of military orders, must submit the report in the second year of the cycle (the next report due in 1949); and all clerical congregations, in the third year (the next report due in 1950). Those who are bound by canon 510 to send a report to the Sacred Congregation must use the questionnaire which the decree says will be furnished for this purpose. It also states that a shorter form will be provided for those superiors who are not obliged under canon 510 to make a report to the Holy See. These are now obliged to make a report to the local Ordinary. They include the major superiors of monasteries *sui iuris,* if the monastery does not belong to a federation (and this report is due in the first year of the cycle, i.e. 1948, 1953 etc.); the major superioresses of monasteries of nuns (the report is due in accordance with the cycle established for institutes of women religious and if the monastery

[5] *Ibid.*, p. 342.
[6] *Ibid.*, p. 378.
[7] *AAS*, XIV (1922), 161.

is subject to a superior of a community of regulars rather than to the local Ordinary, the report is sent to the superior); the superiors general of congregations, quasi-religious societies and secular institutes of diocesan approval and the superiors of all autonomous houses of religious institutes, quasi-religious societies, and secular institutes which do not belong to a federation, whether they have pontifical or diocesan approval. The reports of those included in the last clause are to be made in accordance with the cycle established for those whose obligation arises under canon 510; moreover, those of religious institutes, quasi-religious societies and secular institutes of diocesan approval must be sent to the local Ordinary of the diocese in which the mother house is located, and the latter informs all the local Ordinaries in whose dioceses are located houses of the respective organization, whose judgment must be reported when the original is sent to the Sacred Congregation. In all cases, the local Ordinary or the regular superior must within the year specified, send, with his own comment, the report that he has thus received from the respective organization. In all organizations of women of pontifical approval the report, as in the past, must be sent to the local Ordinary to be signed by him and transmitted to the Sacred Congregation. Moreover, the decree refers to an annual report which all organizations will be required to make in accordance with a form to be drawn up and furnished the respective groups.

A systematic declaration of the status of the Sodality of the Blessed Virgin was made by our Holy Father in an Apostolic Constitution of Sept. 27, 1948.[8] In it he notes that whereas in the first three hundred years of its existence (it was established Dec. 5, 1584) there were never more than ten local units aggregated, in any given year, to the parent union (*Prima Primaria*), since the beginning of the present century there are annually a thousand such aggregations. Our Holy Father points out that the Sodality's aims are those of assisting in the apostolate under the direction of the Hierarchy and that this objective is in no way hampered by the fact that its units may seem to be offshoots of the Society of Jesus. Therefore, he says that the Sodality can be properly described as Catholic Action undertaken under the auspices and the

[8] *AAS*, XL (1948), 393.

inspiration of the Blessed Virgin. He declares that a Sodality, when it is properly aggregated, is a juridical association; for proper aggregation, however, it is declared that it must be established by the Superior General of the Society of Jesus in places subject to the care of the members of this Society and, in other places, either by the local bishop or by the Superior General of the Jesuits with the formal consent of the local bishop. Aggregation is reserved to the Superior General of the Jesuits, but it does not give him any rights over the Sodality. On the contrary, the local Ordinary has complete authority over Sodalities established outside the precincts belonging to the Jesuits, with the power to lay down governing norms for them without violating, however, the substance of their Common Rules; and even as to Sodalities established within the precincts of the Jesuits, the local Ordinary has authority over their exercise of the external apostolate, in accordance always with the sacred canons and the prescriptions of the Holy See. The pastor is the president of parochial Sodalities and the supervisor of all works of the external apostolate performed by any other Sodalities within his territory. The moderator of the Sodality, who must be a priest, enjoys full authority in the direction of the internal affairs of the Sodality in accordance with the Common Rules and in due subjection to his ecclesiastical superiors. Since Sodalities are true associations devoted to the apostolate, whether or not joined in a federation with other such associations or with the parent body of Catholic Action, and since they are constrained in virtue of their aims to render their co-operation to any other such association, it is not necessary that members of the Sodality should join any other such association.

In initiating the establishment of the College of St. Peter in Rome for the native clergy pursuing higher studies, our Holy Father took occasion to address an exhortation to the native clergy. The exhortation, dated July 28, 1948,[9] urged the clergy to be avid of their own sanctification and the salvation of their neighbor, to seek ever increasing proficiency in the sacred and profane sciences, to familiarize themselves with the language of the people under their charge, to profit by the experience of the missioners already

[9] *Ibid.*, p. 374.

laboring in the field entrusted to their care, and to be obedient to their bishop, thus ensuring their unflagging loyalty to the Holy See.

On June 29, 1948,[10] our Holy Father addressed an allocution to the representatives of the Societies of Christian Workingmen; on Sept. 5, 1948,[11] to the young women representing Catholic Action; and on Sept. 12, 1948,[12] to the young men similarly representing the same association.

In the allocution to the Workingmen, while praising their achievements in the past and especially the great number of members they had persuaded to join their ranks, our Holy Father insisted on the necessity that every member should be an active one, prepared to enter enthusiastically into the pursuit of the objectives of the organization. This objective, he said, was admirably and succinctly expressed in the description, "the apostolate of workingmen through workingmen." In the present circumstances, he said, that objective should be sought more especially by the teaching of thrift and reliance on the wage received as the standard determining, in the individual case, the kind of economic life the family would lead, i.e. by educating families to live within their income. Professional men are only waiting to be invited, he said, to show the worker how, within narrow financial resources, to make home a wonderful place in which to live. He reminded them that they were dedicated to the task of promoting conscientious devotion to their tasks on the part of Christian laborers and, while protecting the economic interests of the worker, they must hold themselves bound by the strict rules of justice and by the obligation of co-operating with all the other classes of society to the end that a truly Christian social life might be attained by all. This purpose to which they were dedicated, he said, should make its influence felt in all other organizations in which workingmen were united, especially those established to protect their interests in the formation of labor contracts. He closed the allocution with the Apostolic Benediction, including all workers in the entire world, even though not members of the Church, especially those who are unemployed or who are oppressed by any burdens whether of a spiritual or a material kind.

In the allocution to the young women representatives of Catholic

[10] *Ibid.*, p. 331. [11] *Ibid.*, p. 405. [12] *Ibid.*, p. 409.

Action, who were observing the thirtieth anniversary of the foundation of their organization, he told them that ardor for the spiritual conquest of their sisters was an essential element of their apostolate, an element that they must treasure and make effective in spite of ridicule and in spite of the temptation to impatience with the failure of prompt response to their efforts. The rays of that ardor should play constantly on those who need to be fired by them, but the rays themselves must give forth light and the light must come from Him who is the Light of the World. The allocution closed with the Apostolic Benediction.

In the allocution to the young men representatives of Catholic Action, who were observing the eightieth anniversary of the foundation of their organization, our Holy Father directed their attention to a threefold victory at which they must aim: the victory over the negation of God, the victory over the tyranny of matter, and the victory over social distress. These victories they can procure, he said, only through supernatural living, through prayer, and through love of their fellow man. Under the influence of these forces the religious values they represent will have their proper effect in a world which is said to have lost all appreciation of value.

On Aug. 28, 1948,[13] our Holy Father delivered a radio message to the pilgrims assembled at the Shrine of St. James at Compostella, assuring them that in their pilgrimage there is manifested the spirit of faith and sacrifice, a continuously progressive piety, an unstinted love of their fellow man, and loyalty to, as well as respect and love for, the Church. The message closed with the Apostolic Benediction.

Another radio message was delivered by our Holy Father on Sept. 5, 1948,[14] this one to the Catholics assembled at Mainz to celebrate for the seventy-second time the Catholic Day, the first observance of which occurred in 1848. In addressing the people assembled for the first such observance since Hitler's rise to power, our Holy Father recalled how on eight occasions he himself as Apostolic Nuncio had brought to the people the greetings of the Vicar of Christ. He praised the hundred years that had elapsed since the first Catholic Day for their fullness in organized Catholic

[13] *Ibid.*, p. 414.

[14] *Ibid.*, p. 417.

activity, especially in aid of the missions, and he called on the people to thank Almighty God through whose efforts so much had been accomplished. It was Bishop von Ketteler, our Holy Father reminded them, whose influence was strong not only in inaugurating the observance of Catholic Day but in stimulating the activity of which that Day came to be a symbol. The co-operation between the clergy and the laity which had brought forth such abundant fruit in the preceding hundred years must continue; in it, with the aid of Almighty God, of the Blessed Virgin, and the saints, is the surest pledge that the ravages of war will be effaced and the blessings of peace restored. The message was concluded with the Apostolic Benediction.

Among the recent epistles written by our Holy Father is the one dated July 25, 1948,[15] appointing Clemente Cardinal Micara, Bishop of Velletri, and Prefect of the Sacred Congregation of Rites, as his Legate to the observance in Cologne of the seventh centenary of the building of the Cathedral.

Another epistle, dated Jan. 30, 1948,[16] commends the formation of the Committee of Catholic Action, one of the sections of the Catholic Bishops' Conference of India, charged with the direction of the All-India Catholic Action Organization.

In an epistle of Jan. 18, 1948,[17] our Holy Father accepted the greetings extended to him by the meeting of the Polish Hierarchy held at Czestochowa.

Three recent epistles were commemorative and congratulatory: one, dated July 12, 1948,[18] was addressed to the Superior General of the Clerks Regular of the Poor of the Mother of God of the Pious Schools in commemoration of the third centenary of the death of St. Joseph Calasanctius, the Founder of the Institute, and of the second centenary of his beatification; a second epistle, dated July 30, 1948,[19] congratulated Elia Cardinal dalla Costa, Archbishop of Florence, on the celebration of the silver jubilee of his consecration; and a third, also dated July 30, 1948,[20] commemorated the fiftieth anniversary of the ordination of Most Rev. Giuseppe Migone, titular Archbishop of Nicomedia and Papal Secret Almoner.

[15] *Ibid.*, p. 372.
[16] *Ibid.*, p. 328.
[17] *Ibid.*, p. 324.
[18] *Ibid.*, p. 369.
[19] *Ibid.*, p. 403.
[20] *Ibid.*, p. 404.

Apostolic Letters dated Feb. 2, 1947,[21] declared the Blessed Virgin of Salvation of the City of Monfalcone to be the Patron of the Archdiocese of Gorizia and Grandisca. Three other Apostolic Letters give the rank of Minor Basilica to three churches: one, dated Sept. 22, 1947,[22] to the parochial collegiate church in the City of Porto Maurizio in the Diocese of Albenga; another, dated Nov. 27, 1946,[23] to the Church of the Holy Rosary in the City of Talpa, Diocese of Tepic, Mexico; and a third, dated Dec. 21, 1947,[24] to the Cathedral of the Assumption of the Diocese of Sarzana.

The boundaries and the status of ecclesiastical territorial units has been affected by nine Apostolic Constitutions as follows: A Constitution dated Jan. 8, 1948,[25] raised the Prefecture Apostolic of Iringa in British East Africa to the status of a Vicariate Apostolic; another, also dated Jan. 8, 1948,[26] did the same for the Prefecture Apostolic of Bankusu in the Belgian Congo; a third, dated Jan. 31, 1948,[27] separated the Diocese of Marseilles from the Archdiocese of Aix and made of the former an Archdiocese without suffragans, immediately subject to the Holy See; a fourth, dated Feb. 28, 1948,[28] established a new Diocese, Ambato, from territory previously belonging to the Archdiocese of Quito; a fifth, dated Feb. 5, 1948,[29] transferred the See of Goulbourn, of the Archdiocese of Sydney, to Canberra, and raised it to the rank of an Archdiocese, to be known as the Archdiocese of Canberra and Goulbourn, immediately subject to the Holy See; a sixth, dated Feb. 12, 1948,[30] raised the Prefecture Apostolic of Cook Islands, in Polynesia, to the rank of a Vicariate Apostolic; a seventh, also dated Feb. 12, 1948,[31] made two Vicariates out of one (formerly Onitsha-Owerri in British West Africa): the Vicariate Apostolic of Onitsha and the Vicariate Apostolic of Owerri; an eighth, similarily dated Feb. 12, 1948,[32] raised the Prefecture Apostolic of Ipamu in the Belgian Congo to the rank of a Vicariate Apostolic;

[21] *Ibid.*, p. 364.
[22] *Ibid.*, p. 365.
[23] *Ibid.*, p. 362.
[24] *Ibid.*, p. 367.
[25] *Ibid.*, p. 306.
[26] *Ibid.*, p. 308.
[27] *Ibid.*, p. 309.
[28] *Ibid.*, p. 311.
[29] *Ibid.*, p. 353.
[30] *Ibid.*, p. 355.
[31] *Ibid.*, p. 357.
[32] *Ibid.*, p. 359.

and a ninth, dated likewise Feb. 12, 1948,[33] separated territory from the Vicariate Apostolic of Kroonstad in the Orange Free State and established a new Vicariate Apostolic of Bethlehem.

A decree of the Sacred Consistorial Congregation of May 22, 1948,[34] separated four parishes from the Diocese of Ostia and joined them to the Diocese of Rome.

In accepting, on July 13, 1948,[35] the credentials of the Ambassador of Ecuador our Holy Father addressed an allocution to him praising the loyalty of the people of his country to the Holy See and expressing high hope that the Catholic principles which dominate that people will make a notable contribution to the establishment of world peace.

A decree of the Sacred Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith, dated Nov. 18, 1947,[36] established a General Council of The Apostolic Work Society in Dublin and provided that the centers already established in Ireland should be subject to it, with ultimate dependence on the Sacred Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith. The General Council was to be composed of the Diocesan Moderators with an ecclesiastic at the head who was not to be chosen from a religious group devoted to the missions. An index of indulgences and privileges granted to members of the Society is appended to the decree.[37]

By a decree of Feb. 1, 1948,[38] the Sacred Congregation of Rites authorized the introduction of the Cause of the Servant of God, Antonia Maria of Mercy, Foundress of the Institute of the Oblates of the Most Holy Redeemer; and by a decree of May 23, 1948,[39] the same Sacred Congregation declared that proof had been accepted of the two miracles required for the canonization of Blessed Vincenza Gerosa. The August number of the *Acta* contains the Apostolic Letters announcing the beatification, on Nov. 9, 1947,[40] of Blessed Jeanne Delanoue, Foundress of the Institute of St. Anne of Providence, and on April 4, 1948,[41] of Blessed Benildus (in the world, Pierre Romancon), a Christian Brother.

[33] *Ibid.*, p. 360.
[34] *Ibid.*, p. 341.
[35] *Ibid.*, p. 338.
[36] *Ibid.*, p. 423.
[37] *Ibid.*, p. 425.
[38] *Ibid.*, p. 381.
[39] *Ibid.*, p. 384.
[40] *Ibid.*, p. 314.
[41] *Ibid.*, p. 319.

Under date of July 24, 1948,[42] the Sacred Consistorial Congregation reported the elevation of Most Rev. Edward P. McManaman, D.D., to the Titular See of Floriana, and his appointment as Auxiliary to the Bishop of Erie.

RECENT PONTIFICAL APPOINTMENTS ANNOUNCED IN THE ACTA APOSTOLICAE SEDIS

Domestic Prelates of His Holiness:

Oct. 11, 1945: Rt. Rev. Msgr. Howard Carroll, of the Diocese of Pittsburgh.

Oct. 30, 1945: Rt. Rev. Msgr. Michael F. Delaney, of the Archdiocese of Boston.

Feb. 15, 1947: Rt. Rev. Msgrs. George W. Ahr and James A. MacKinson, of the Archdiocese of Newark.

Nov. 1, 1947: Rt. Rev. Msgrs. Frederick G. Hochwalt, August J. Kramer, Cletus A. Miller, Carl J. Ryan, and Henry J. Waldhaus, of the Archdiocese of Cincinnati.

Nov. 19, 1947: Rt. Rev. Msgr. Edward Boyle, of the Archdiocese of Philadelphia.

Nov. 27, 1947: Rt. Rev. Msgrs. Patrick A. Flanagan, Edward M. Gleeson, Ernest Graham, John S. Palubicki, John L. Paschang, and George A. Smiskol, of the Archdiocese of Omaha.

Dec. 15, 1947: Rt. Rev. Msgrs. Patrick Dunne and Thomas A. Matthews, of the Diocese of San Diego.

Dec. 19, 1947: Rt. Rev. Msgrs. Leslie V. Barnes and Daniel B. O'Connor, of the Diocese of Lincoln.

Jan. 22, 1948: Rt. Rev. Msgrs. John H. Anderson, Bronislaus A. Smykowski, and Francis M. O'Shea, of the Diocese of Hartford; and Edwin F. Murphy, of the Diocese of Steubenville.

Jan. 30, 1948: Rt. Rev. Msgr. Eugene A. Loftus, of the Diocese of Buffalo.

Feb. 3, 1948: Rt. Rev. Msgrs. Alexander A. Ciocia, Edward J. Donovan, Francis X. Downing, John F. Dwyer, Conrad B. Lutz, John B. Lyle, Edward J. Mullaney, Thomas F. Murray, Allen T. Pendleton, John J. Robinson, John F. Ross, Stanislaus Rysiakiewicz, Thomas A. Scanlan, Thomas A. Sharkey, and John Wynne, of the Diocese of Brooklyn; Robert Bogg, Charles F. Bolte, Salvatore Cianci, Edmund F. Falicki, Daniel Hyland, Joseph A. Koss, and Joseph A. Lipkus, of the Diocese of Grand Rapids; and John L. Bardon, Stephen W. Begalla, Maurice J. Casey, James M.

[42] *Ibid.*, p. 377.

Eischen, Owen L. Gallagher, Alfred J. Heinrich, Louis S. Kazmirski, Francis J. Lavery, John H. Lenz, Alfred J. Manning, Walter B. Martin, William J. Murphy, William S. Nash, Andrew A. Prokop, Leo A. Schlindwein, and John A. Stipanovic, of the Diocese of Youngstown.

Feb. 13, 1948: Rt. Rev. Msgr. Peter Kurz, of the Archdiocese of Newark.

April 3, 1948: Rt. Rev. Msgr. Joseph M. McShea, of the Archdiocese of Philadelphia.

April 7, 1948: Rt. Rev. Msgr. Vitus Franco of the Diocese of Youngstown.

Privy Chamberlains Supernumerary of His Holiness:

Jan. 30, 1948: Very Rev. Msgrs. Francis A. Garvey and J. Lodge McHugh, of the Diocese of Buffalo.

Feb. 3, 1948: Very Rev. Msgrs. Vincent Baldwin, John B. Balkunas, John Carberry, Francis X. FitzGibbon, John J. Heneghan, Peter E. Kelaher, Joseph A. McCormack, and James J. McGowan, of the Diocese of Brooklyn; Anthony P. Arszulowicz, Arthur F. Bukowski, William J. Murphy, and Joseph E. Shaw, of the Diocese of Grand Rapids; and William T. Bradley and George Rieffer, of the Archdiocese of Santa Fe.

Feb. 25, 1948: Very Rev. Msgrs. William M. Drum and Anthony A. Esswein, of the Archdiocese of St. Louis.

April 29, 1948: Very Rev. Msgr. Paul Tanner, of the Archdiocese of Milwaukee.

Commander with Plaque of the Order of Pius:

Dec. 14, 1945: Leo T. Crowley, of the Archdiocese of Milwaukee.

Grand Cross of the Order of St. Gregory the Great, civil class:

July 22, 1946: Robert E. Hannegan, former Postmaster General.

Commander with Plaque of the Order of St. Gregory the Great, civil class:

Sept. 25, 1945: Lt. Col. Orfeo Bizzozzero and Col. Charles Poletti.

July 22, 1946: Gail Sullivan.

Grand Cross of the Order of St. Sylvester, Pope:

Dec. 28, 1945: William J. Donovan.

Knight of the Order of St. Gregory the Great, civil class:

Dec. 15, 1947: Leonard F. Baxter, Clarence F. Boggian, Joseph Brady, James A. Crane, Terence Mackin, John McGeever, John G.

McMahon, Raymond McCaffrey, Joseph Palughi, Philip A. Payne and Herbert Zoghby, of the Diocese of Mobile; and John F. Fitzpatrick, John G. Galligan, and William E. Leary, of the Diocese of Salt Lake.

Jan. 22, 1948: Joseph A. Girouard and William L. McGovern, of the Diocese of Hartford.

Feb. 3, 1948: David Askin, Philip Farley, Joseph McNamara, Michael O'Brien, Charles Patridge, and George A. Sheean, of the Diocese of Brooklyn; and Thomas A. O'Neill, of the Diocese of Buffalo.

Feb. 23, 1948: Peter Kneifl, of the Archdiocese of St. Louis.

April 29, 1948: Charles O'Hara, Sylvester J. Wabiszewski, Francis M. Surges, Edward F. Kastenholz, Henry S. Johnston, and Norman J. Kopmeier, of the Archdiocese of Milwaukee.

JEROME D. HANNAN

The Catholic University of America
Washington, D. C.

THE GIFT OF WISDOM

There is a third wisdom that is not acquired by study but which comes supernaturally as a gift of the Holy Spirit. Even in the natural order we find something analogous to this. A virtuous man possesses a wisdom that does not come from study or instruction. He may be untutored and illiterate, yet he has a wisdom that comes from his virtuous inclinations alone. These inclinations enable him to order his life rightly and pass a correct judgment on all his acts. The Holy Spirit gives such a gift to those who love Him, a gift that enables them to judge of divine things connaturally and instinctively rather than as a result of scientific equipment and training. This is the wisdom of the saints, a supernatural wisdom that brings about a supernatural unification in the life and judgments of a man who is always ready to obey the instincts of the Spirit of God dwelling within him.

—Dr. William R. O'Connor, in "The Wisdom of Theology," published in the first volume of the *Proceedings* of The Catholic Theological Society of America (New York, 1946), p. 28.

Book Reviews

THE FIRST FREEDOM. By Wilfrid Parsons, S.J. Foreword by Most Rev. Francis P. Keough, D.D. New York: The Declan X. McMullen Co., 1948. Pp. xii+178. $2.25.

It is of special significance that the recent Pastoral Letter of the American Hierarchy on "The Christian in Action" has taken as its theme "the wall of separation between Church and State" as interpreted in recent decisions of the Supreme Court and specifically in the McCollum Case referring to "released time" for religious instruction.

The question assumes a two-fold character. Does any form of Federal aid to a private school conducted under religious auspices or to students as attending such a school violate the principle of separation as established by the American Constitution? Is any form of cooperation between the public school authorities and representatives of religious bodies, such as the arrangement of class schedules or the use of public school premises, to provide for the religious instruction of students attending the public schools, contrary to the First or the Fourteenth Amendment of the Constitution or to the American tradition?

There has been a considerable amount of effective opposition in the past to anything like Federal Aid for Catholic schools, not necessarily because such aid would be unconstitutional, but because the opposition disliked Catholicism. The separation of Church and State, however, has always been advanced as a kind of smoke screen for the issue. Today, with the general growth of agnosticism, the same mechanism is invoked; but the real motive now is to remove all religion, particularly organized religion, from public, and, if possible, from private life, as an invalid and harmful interpretation of man and the universe.

Many Catholics have been hesitant about taking a stand on the matter of Federal and State aid, for the reason that they feared that undesirable State control might follow upon State aid. In view of recent statements of the Pontiffs, as well as in consideration of the increasingly heavy burden of expense involved in the maintenance of a parochial system of education by Catholic taxpayers, there is now evident a revision of sentiment on this respect. The situation today derives from the fact that Catholic educators and other religious bodies and spokesmen are asserting at least the *right* to certain common facilities and subsidies for education under the law. Against this position stands the phalanx of those who have been working tirelessly for the elimination of all education except that of the public school, sponsored and controlled by the State for the creation of a secularist mentality.

In the opinion of the American Bishops, the decision of the Supreme Court in the McCollum Case has dealt a severe blow to the Constitutional rights of American citizens and religious groups, and, by a "novel" interpretation of the First Amendment, has established a dangerous precedent, which calls for immediate and thorough review of the whole question.

"The First Freedom" by Father Parsons provides such a review, in concise and logical form. Taking seriously the challenge that this is a *legal* question "respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof," he pursues the subject historically. From the facts involved in the drawing up of the Constitution, through the legislative and judicial applications of the principle, he proceeds to a formulation of the American tradition of the relations between Church and State which may be regarded as both ethically and legally satisfying. Finally, he examines in detail the arguments advanced against the position taken in substance by the Bishops.

From this evidence, it appears that the First Amendment forbids the establishment of a national Church or favoritism to any existing Church, but does not prohibit Federal aid for a Church-sponsored activity of civic, cultural, or charitable benefit to society. The author asserts that what is legitimate and necessary in this country is "co-operation between Church and State, which brings unity and the common good, not a trumped-up fallacy of separation *vs.* union, which only divides our citizenry."

Catholics and non-Catholics alike should be acquainted with this important contribution to a controversial subject of the utmost importance. The clergy, in particular, will find it a sound guide to good American and Catholic thinking, on a basic controversy which is only beginning and is bound to have the most far-reaching effects.

JAMES A. MAGNER

A LEXICON OF ST. THOMAS AQUINAS BASED ON THE SUMMA THEOLOGICA AND SELECTED PASSAGES FROM HIS OTHER WORKS. By Roy J. Deferrari, Sister Mary Inviolata Barry, C.D.P., and Reverend Joseph Ignatius McGuiness, O.P. Fascicle I, A-C. Washington: The Catholic University of America Press, 1948. Pp. x+262. $12.50.

This *Lexicon* is a manifest and extremely valuable contribution to world scholarship. It is the first complete dictionary of the *Summa* ever published. Its three distinguished authors are to be congratulated for a truly masterly achievement, a work which will inevitably contribute towards a definite and important advance in the study of St. Thomas.

Every word employed in the *Summa Theologica* is listed in this new *Lexicon*. The basic meaning of the Latin term is given in English. Furthermore the lexicon gives *in extenso* a Latin passage from the *Summa* in which St. Thomas' use of the word is adequately exemplified. The articles on some of the key words, such as *"actus," "agere," "anima," "certitudo,"* and *"corpus,"* contain a wealth of information about St. Thomas' teaching hitherto unavailable to the student in any single volume.

The book is a necessity for today's theologian. No man seriously interested in the study of Thomism will neglect it. It will be of inestimable service to beginners, yet only those who have given years of their lives to the study of St. Thomas' teaching will be able adequately to appreciate its excellence. Its appearance constitutes an unmistakable indication that American Catholic scholarship has come of age.

The complete *Lexicon* will consist of five fascicles, only the first of which has yet been published. The remaining four will be in print within a few months.

JOSEPH CLIFFORD FENTON

LA MORT ET L'ASSOMPTION DE LA SAINTE VIÈRGE. Etude historico-doctrinale (Studi e testi 59). By Martin Jugie, A.A. Città del Vaticano: Bibliotheca apostolica vaticana, 1944. Pp. viii+747.

In modern times, especially since the Vatican Council, Catholic scholars have produced a great number of studies dealing with the problem of the Assumption of the Blessed Virgin. A foremost scholar and prolific writer on this subject is M. Jugie of the Assumptionist Fathers, who has contributed numerous articles to periodicals, especially to *Echos d'orient*. In *La mort et l'assomption de la Sainte Vièrge* he has produced a work which can truly be called a gigantic study considered from the quantity of the matter and the quality of scholarship.

Comprised of three parts, *La mort et l'assomption de la Sainte Vièrge* is a historico-doctrinal study. The first two parts treat the history of the Assumption from the beginning to the present time, a work (which Jugie says) has never been done, at least with the fullness of treatment which he devotes to it (p. vii). In the first part M. Jugie studies the problem of the death and Assumption of the Blessed Virgin in Sacred Scripture, in the tradition of the first six centuries, and in apocryphal literature. He then discusses the origin, import, and meaning of the feast in the East and in the West. The last two sections are concerned with the Greek and western tradition from the seventh to the end of the ninth centuries. The section which carries the history down to the present opens with a chapter on the ideas about the death and

Assumption of the Blessed Virgin current among the Nestorians and Monophysites. M. Jugie then goes on to a study of the Assumption in the Byzantine and Graeco-Russian Church, beginning with the tenth century. The third chapter, by far the longest in this section, is devoted to a study of the history of the doctrine of the Assumption in the Latin Church since the end of the ninth century.

In the section on the Assumption and Sacred Scripture, after asserting that St. John certainly knew how Mary left this earth (p. 14), Jugie concentrates on the twelfth chapter of the Apocalypse. In a lengthy discussion he argues enthusiastically that this chapter offers some direct scriptural indication (p. 14) of Mary's glorious Assumption. Perhaps the author pleads a bit too perfervidly, and it is conceivable that many will not see eye-to-eye with him. Nevertheless, his observations merit serious consideration and will be of immense service if they will cause greater attention to be given to the Marial interpretation of these verses. Concentrating almost exclusively on the Apocalypse, M. Jugie has placed all his eggs in one basket. Despite the lack of explicit scriptural references to the Assumption, there is in Sacred Scripture a *corpus Marianum* that may well be the foundation of Mary's Assumption. True, the author treats much of this in the third section dealing with the theology of the Assumption, but this reviewer would like to have seen a complete handling of the biblical passages that may have a bearing on the problem.

Concluding his study of the first six centuries, M. Jugie says that he has not found any absolutely clear and explicit testimony to the Assumption as understood by present-day Catholic theology (p. 101). This is a well thought-out and honest conclusion, especially since it is a reversal of the former sanguine opinion which he published in *Echos d'Orient* in 1926. In this section it mght have been well had Jugie anticipated more the objections concerned with the silence of the early centuries. Also, because of the stake placed in it by some writers, the problem of the sarcophagus of Saragossa merited more than being brushed aside in a footnote (p. 102).

Worthy of special commendation is Jugie's treatment of the Assumption in the apocryphal literature, generally known as the *Transitus Mariae*. Here he honestly admits that in matters of this kind it is not always easy to arrive at certitude, and that conjecture must necessarily play a part (p. 106). All may not agree with his opinions on the dating and dependence of some of these versions. Nevertheless, his generous analyses of these works cannot help but be enlightening. That some of them refer not to a true assumption but to a translation of the body to an earthly paradise (p. 105) shows that they are not all in agreement on the lot of Mary when she left this earth. However, even in their

divergence of views on this subject they do manifest a common mentality that there was something extraordinary in the final lot of the Blessed Virgin. Furthermore, in their divergence of views, these apocrypha, as M. Jugie points out (p. 169), are important for the historian of dogma. In this section on the apocrypha one would like to see further corroboration for the assertion that Syria is the place of origin for the theme of the *Transitus Mariae*. Furthermore, it is to be regretted that the author did not give a detailed demonstration to back his claim that the Latin version published by Wilmart (*Studi e testi,* LIX [1933], 325-57), and hailed by Rivière as the oldest Latin version of the *Transitus* (*Recherches de théologie ancienne et médievale,* VIII [1936], 5-23), is nothing else but an eighth century abridged Latin translation of the Greek account of John of Thessalonica (pp. 150 ff).

M. Jugie's handling of the Greek tradition and oriental beliefs is what is to be expected from a scholar who has written so much in this field. Special commendation is due for the thoroughness given to these aspects and also to the history of the Assumption in the pre-scholastic West. So often, in the history of a doctrine, some writers jump from Scripture and the Patristic period to the flowering of Scholasticism and completely ignore or skimpily treat the above-mentioned fields. Fortunately, M. Jugie does not suffer from this theological myopia, and his work is all the richer for this reason. In fact, his presentation of the history of the doctrine of the Assumption is a fine model for a history of doctrine and theology in general.

As one can readily visualize, Jugie's work is a panoramic sweep of the history of the Assumption throughout the centuries. Rarely have so many accomplishments in scholarship been combined in one man or in one book. He is at home in the handling of sources: scriptural, patristic, medieval, scholastic, liturgical and oriental, sources in print and some only in manuscript; his is a happy combination of positive and speculative theology; he is conversant with the best in modern scholarship. It goes without saying that he has not treated exhaustively all the authors who make their appearance as the centuries roll by. There is room for numerous specialized studies on the thought of individual authors. However, he has covered the salient features of the authors treated. The historical section of this work gives an answer to the question of what was thought of the doctrine of the Assumption in any given period. As such it is an *Enchiridion fontium doctrinae Assumptionis B. V. Mariae.* Historical scholarship in general, and theology in particular, are definitely enriched because of this study by Père Jugie.

ALFRED C. RUSH, C.SS.R.

LES RITES ET PRIÈRES DU SAINT SACRIFICE DE LA MESSE. By Chanoine Aug. Croegaert. Vol. I. 2nd ed. Malines: H. Dessain, 1948. Pp. xl+607. 150 *frs belges,* unbound; 200 *frs belges,* bound.

The second edition of the first volume of Canon Croegaert's comprehensive work on the liturgy of the Mass represents a much enlarged issue of the original publication of a decade ago, brought up to date with the latest legislation and with the provisions of *Mediator Dei.* The sub-title of the work, *Plans pour sermons et leçons,* indicates the purpose of the author to furnish not only a text-book and reference book of liturgy but also to supply liturgical matter for use in the composition of sermons.

The present volume treats only of the Mass of the Catechumens. Volumes two and three will be concerned with the Mass of the Faithful, the division between the two coming at the Preface. Only 243 of the 607 pages of this first volume are given to the Mass itself. More than half of the book is devoted to matters respecting the altar, the vestments, the cross, the candles, and similar required articles for the celebration of Mass. It is strange that there is nothing concerning the chalice and paten and their appurtenances, the consideration of which must no doubt have been left to the subsequent volumes.

The treatment of the topics presented is encyclopedic in extent. For example, in connection with the altar, there is a detailed description of the ritual for its consecration. The same is true of the section on church bells, which includes a history of their use and an account of the ceremonial of their consecration. The author's consideration of the altar crucifix occupies more than a score of pages, which strangely enough, is as much as is devoted to the history, symbolism, and use of all six vestments. The chant receives the even briefer treatment of half a dozen pages.

Concerning certain moot questions, the author leaves no doubt as to his own opinion. For example, in the matter of constructing altars facing the people, while such a disposition of the table of sacrifice has the support of the practice of the first ten centuries of Christianity, while there is no legislation against it, while the principle which dictates it is a sound one, Canon Croegaert believes that it should be put in practice only in particular instances, under certain precautions, and with the approval of the Ordinary. Similarly, with regard to the so-called Gothic chasubles, after citing the decree of Dec. 9, 1925, forbidding departures in vestments from the received style of the Church, the author evidently expresses his own opinion in recording the ruling of the Archbishop of Malines permitting in the design of the chasuble only the traditional Roman form and the "moderate" Gothic form.

The present work may be confidently recommended as a desirable

addition to any library of liturgical books. It is thoroughly documented and provided with an ample bibliography. When the third volume appears, and with it the index, consultation of the work will be much facilitated. The mechanical make-up of the book is, in general, quite attractive. The paper is good, the print is clear, and the illustrations, mostly reproductions of Alinari prints, interesting. We should prefer a less robust size of type for some of the headings, especially in the table of contents, and at the same time we should recommend less crowded text in the body of the work.

WILLIAM J. LALLOU

DISCOURSES ON OUR LADY. By the Rev. Nicholas O'Rafferty. Milwaukee: The Bruce Publishing Company, 1948. Pp. x + 257. $3.25.

The author's primary intention in writing this book was to furnish our preachers with a handy set of short sermons, thirty-three in all, on Our Blessed Lady's singular prerogatives and titles. But the book will prove valuable also as spiritual reading and meditation for Sisters and seminarians, and indeed for all devout clients of Mary, no matter what their state of life.

Here we have a complete treatise of popular Mariology in synthesis ingeniously adapted to the capacity of our average audiences in the United States. Fr. O'Rafferty has the enviable ability to present the most difficult and delicate theological questions in a language which makes them readily accessible even to the least trained among the laity. No abstruse technicalities, no subtle distinctions, but a neat and lucid exposition of Catholic teaching on the various Marian prerogatives in a charming style which reveals both good taste and facility as a writer.

Of particular interest to us was the chapter on Mary's Co-redemption, concerning which we may be allowed a few observations. The author repeatedly styles Mary "Co-redeemer" of the human race. Would not perhaps the word "Co-redemptrix" be a happier choice? Both terms are, of course, equally legitimate and they both convey exactly the same idea, but the former might perhaps sound a little bold and harsh to some ears. Again, in explaining Mary's role as Co-redemptrix, the author rightly stresses her intimate co-operation in the redemptive work by means of her free consent to the divine plan of salvation and particularly her sufferings. In this connection we might have expected at least a mention of the *meritorious and satisfactory value* which her co-operation had in the sight of God *for the redemption itself.* This is, after all, what constitutes the very essence of Mary's Co-redemption. It is precisely this feature that distinguishes her co-operation from